University of Alberta

Towards the Righting of Music History: Re-thinking the Concept of Nationalism in Western Music Historiography

by

Olesia Talpash

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts

Department of Music

Edmonton, Alberta

Fall, 1997

National Library of Canada
Acquisitions and Bibliographic Services
395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada
Acquisitions et services bibliographiques
395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

The author has granted a non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of this thesis in microform, paper or electronic formats.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de cette thèse sous la forme de microfiche/film, de reproduction sur papier ou sur format électronique.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

0-612-22559-3

Canada

University of Alberta

Library Release Form

Name of Author: Olesia Talpash

Title of Thesis: Towards the Righting of Music History: Re-thinking the Concept of Nationalism in Western Music Historiography

Degree: Master of Arts

Year this Degree Granted: 1997

Permission is hereby granted to the University of Alberta Library to reproduce single copies of this thesis and to lend or sell such copies for private, scholarly, or scientific research purposes only.

The author reserves all other publication and other rights in association with the copyright in the thesis, and except as hereinbefore provided, neither the thesis nor any substantial portion thereof may be printed or otherwise reproduced in any material form whatever without the author's prior written permission.

Olesia Talpash

Olesia Talpash
Edmonton, Alberta

September 29, 1997
Date

University of Alberta

Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research for acceptance, a thesis entitled *Towards the Righting of Music History: Re-thinking the Concept of Nationalism in Western Music Historiography* submitted by Olesia Talpash in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts.

David Gramit

Regula Qureshi

Frances Swyripa

September 29, 1997
Date

For it is not meant to speak here of those wild and irregular melodies which come within the description of National Music . . . *Of this artless music, which is best learned in the nursery and the street, I shall speak hereafter; and at present confine my disquisitions and enquiries to* real Music, *arising from a complete scale under the guidance of such rules of art as successful cultivation has rendered respectable and worthy of imitation.*

Dr. Charles Burney
A General History of Music, Volume I, 1789

For Orest

and

Loyal Affiliates:

Lydia, Andriy, Yvan, Larissa and Roman

Abstract

Donald J. Grout and Claude V. Palisca, authors of the well-known and widely-used *A History of Western Music*, Fifth Edition, write that "Nationalism in nineteenth-century music was marked by an emphasis on literary and linguistic traditions, an interest in folklore, a large dose of patriotism, and a craving for independence and identity." However, the authors claim that this phenomenon of nationalism--"not really an issue" in the music of canonically sanctioned, prominent, primarily Austro-Germanic composers--was keenest amongst those threatened by and unequal to German musical dominance. In this, as in traditional music histories overall, German music alone is presented as neither affected by nor an exponent of musical nationalism.

This essay argues precisely the opposite. A deconstructive reading of relevant sections of the Grout-Palisca text identifies the concept of nationalism in music history as a historiographical "othering" device. According to the text's definitional criteria, German music, like every other nineteenth-century music, could be considered nationalistic. That it is not indicates the extent to which German musical nationalism is both grounded in and justified by the Romantic aesthetic of "absolute music." This unequivocally Germanocentric aesthetic discourse not only positions non-German music as nationalistic and, therefore, Other; it also serves as a fundamental historiographical norm for the institutionalized discipline of Western music history.

Acknowledgements

To Dr. David Gramit and his exemplary generosity: knowledge, interest, encouragement, an always understanding patience, and time were freely given. For this, a sincere thank you.

To Dr. Regula Qureshi and her lively interest in this topic; to Dr. Frances Swyripa and her historian's acuity to which, at this point, I can only aspire; and to both for taking the time to read this essay and to hear its defence.

To Maestro Wolodymyr Kolesnyk, Dr. Christopher Lewis, and Dr. Brian Harris: Thank you.

Table of Contents

I	**Introduction: The Concept of Nationalism-in-Music and the Question of Historiographical "Othering"**	1
II	**The Concept of Nationalism in the History of Nineteenth-Century Music**	15
	Definitional Problems and Functional Contradictions	15
	Nationalism in Current Music-Historical Scholarship	21
	Nationalism Beyond Musicology	28
III	**The Concept of Nationalism in Grout-Palisca's *A History of Western Music*, Fifth Edition**	36
	A Descriptive Analysis	39
	A Deconstructive Reading	56
IV	**Conclusions**	81
V	**Bibliography**	90

I Introduction: The Concept of Nationalism-in-music and the Question of Historiographical "Othering"

> What is needed is distance from conventional patterns of thought and discourse to plot the naturalizing of practices that have been culturally constituted, institutionally authorized, and therefore, open to challenge.
>
> Karen-Edis Barzman[1]

I grew up with a music--folk, art, and liturgical--which, I was to discover through formal music studies, did not exist. This music appeared to have neither a practical nor an historical existence: it was absent from the syllabi of prescribed works for my piano and voice lessons, as well as from the repertoires of school- and university-based choral ensembles; and except for a rare, if any, mention in the Russian and/or the "Nationalism" sections of most histories of Western art music, it apparently had no history.

The music in question here is Ukrainian music--although it could be any one of a number of "non-existent" musics: Canadian, for example[2]--and within the traditional institutions of Western art music, its existential dilemma persists. Commanding neither recognition, acceptance, nor authority within the international community of music scholarship, this repertoire continues to be excluded from the so-called mainstream art-music concert tradition, the canon of

---

[1]Karen-Edis Barzman, "Beyond the Canon: Feminists, Postmodernism, and the History of Art," *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 52/3 (Summer 1994): 327-339.

[2]The most recent edition, that is, the Fifth Edition of *A History of Western Music* by Donald J. Grout and Claude V. Palisca (New York and London: W. W. Norton & Company, 1996), makes no mention of Canadian music, neither in the body nor the index of the text!

great works, and of particular importance for this essay, from the academic discourse of historical musicology. This music, in short, has been judged non-eventworthy;[3] as such, it has no history.

At this point, it is necessary to ask how a particular repertoire of music might come to be judged a non-event when out in the real world of lived experience, Ukrainian music, for example, clearly exists. It is known and performed both within and, although to a lesser extent, outside its cultural milieu; its history has been abundantly documented (albeit primarily in its own and the Russian languages). It is, in this case, necessarily historical and, therefore, an event. However, it is an event with distinct and limited boundaries because the public perception of this music is (1) significantly context-specific, that is, as a repertoire associated with amateur performances at folk heritage festivals and other such multicultural displays; and (2) decidedly one-dimensional, insofar as this music is generally understood, regardless of genre, to consist primarily of "national" or folk song and dance music.[4] As such, it is defined and delimited by the label "ethnic":

---

[3]Paul Veyne in *Writing History: Essay on Epistemology* (Éditions de Seuil, 1971), translated by Mina Moore-Rinvolucri (Middletown, Connecticut: Wesleyan University Press, 1984), writes that "history is an account of events" (4). Veyne defines an event as "not a being, but an intersection of possible itineraries . . . [events] are a découpage we freely make in reality, an aggregate of the processes in which substances, men, and things interact" (36-37). My use of the term "non-eventworthy" here draws on Veyne's notion of an event as "an intersection of possible itineraries" in order to suggest that the "itinerary" of Ukrainian music history has either not intersected with music-historical itineraries already constituting Western historical musicology, or else that Ukrainian music is simply "an incident or a detail on another [itinerary]" (36).

[4]This is a perception that merits closer examination. See, for example, Larry Wolff, *Inventing Eastern Europe: The Map of Civilization on the Mind of the Enlightenment* (Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1994), 331, who argues that "remarkable customs could always be construed as entertaining, but with the added element of folkloric description, an account of singing and dancing, the anthropological representation of Eastern Europe became quite literally a work of entertainment. The idea of Eastern Europe as a folkloric domain of song

a representation which, I submit, marks this music as different--as Other--and in doing so, nourishes and promotes the well-established and tenacious *mainstream/ethnic* paradigm in Canadian society.[5]

Traditional histories of Western art music employ a closely related and equally tenacious paradigm to describe and classify the musics of late nineteenth-century Europe. In its various formulations as "simply"--that is, unlabelled--music,[6] "universal," "cosmopolitan," and/or even "unselfconscious-nationalism-in-music" in opposition to "(always self-consciously or intentionally) nationalistic music," this familiar and, somewhat surprisingly largely undisputed

---

and dance, first elaborated in the Enlightenment, has survived into the twentieth century and our own times."

[5]Walker Connor, *Ethnonationalism: The Quest for Understanding* (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1994), points out that although the term *ethnicity* "is derived from *Ethnos*, the Greek word for *nation* in the latter's pristine sense of a group characterized by common descent," American sociologists came to employ the term *ethnic group* to refer to subgroups or minorities within the context of a larger society (100-101). The Canadian approach to and use of the term "ethnic" is much the same. See Bernard Saint-Jacques, "Ethnic and Race Relations" in *The Canadian Encyclopedia* (Edmonton: Hurtig Publishers, 1985, Vol.1), 594-595; and Linda Hutcheon and Marion Richmond, eds., "Introduction" to *Other Solitudes: Canadian Multicultural Fictions* (Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1990), who write: "In using the term 'multicultural' in our subtitle, we rather pointedly avoid the term 'ethnic'" because its conventional use points to a "hierarchy of social and cultural privilege . . . [it is a word that] always has to do with the social positioning of the 'other', and is thus never free of relations of power and value" (2).

[6]This lack of a label is significant because it indicates a line of thought fundamental to the dominant tradition in all fields of education. Elizabeth Kamarck Minnich, *Transforming Knowledge* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1990), argues: "that which does not carry a prefix seems to be, is assumed to be, universal; literature as it has been taught by professional scholars is the thing-itself, while women's literature is a kind of literature . . . the more prefixes, the further from the real, the significant, the best" (42). The "unlabelled" then, is perceived as the norm, the ideal. We will rarely, if ever, read, for example, about Brahms as "the German nationalist composer," despite the fact that Brahms's "patriotism" has been well-documented. See, for example, the articles by David Beveridge and Michael Beckerman in Michael Beckerman, ed., *Dvořák and his World* (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1993).

mainstream/nationalist[7] dichotomy distinguishes between two kinds of music. The first consists primarily of the central or dominant tradition of German, and to a lesser extent, French and Italian musics; the second, of the (predominantly East-) European "periphery": that is, everyone else's musics which, by implication, are not central and therefore marginal and/or Other.

While it may appear that the preceding paragraph departs abruptly from a distinctly Canadian experiential context to a European academic one, I will argue that this is deceptive: there is, in fact, no shift at all. And that it *is* not attests to the extent that North American academic institutions have accepted, indeed, assimilated and appropriated a music-historic and music-historiographic tradition which originated elsewhere and in response to the socio-political and cultural demands of another time.

The discipline of historical musicology, officially founded in 1885 by Guido Adler in a newly-unified Germany, and the predominantly European music within its professional purview have come to enjoy an almost global recognition and validity. Together they comprise what is regarded by some a truly international language.[8] This is a "language" that to a large extent both constitutes and shapes the musical identity of countless nations, Western and non-Western alike. It is a "language" that, at least in its North American home, in the academy and beyond,

---

[7]I have borrowed this dichotomy from David Beveridge's article "Dvořák's 'Dumka' and the Concept of Nationalism in Music Historiography," *Journal of Musicological Research* 12 (1993): 303-325.

[8]See the "Preface" to Grout and Palisca, *A History of Western Music*, Fifth Edition, xi.

has effected and subsequently systematized a hierarchy of musics, music histories, and/or music-historical nations.

The mainstream/ethnic and mainstream/nationalist dichotomies mentioned above, therefore, are in many ways related and perhaps even identical socio-cultural phenomena. Although generated within ostensibly different geo-aesthetic contexts, both issue from and are sustained by this normative, and after some 110 years, invisible hierarchical process--a process fed in part, for example, by the following sort of entrenched and accepted patterns of thought.

In a lecture entitled "Musical Scholarship Today," and delivered as part of the 1968-69 lecture/seminar series marking the inauguration of a new chair in musicology at New York's City University, Friedrich Blume suggests that beginning students in the field of historical musicology should start with "two fields of fundamental learning: with music and with languages," and explains in turn the indispensability of Latin, English--primarily for the purposes of facilitating access to documents and general communication respectively--French, Italian, and German. Identifying Germany as the "the cradle of modern musicology," Blume states: "I must admit I hardly see how any reasonable study of musicology can be imagined without [the knowledge of German]." On the other hand, "I will pass over the Slavic or the Asiatic or African languages, which may be regarded as a matter for specialized studies, and I will leave aside Greek and

Spanish, desirable as they may be."[9] Blume's remarks here concern specific language requirements for the study of historical musicology; but they are directly reflective of Western music history's very specific ethno-musical interests and differential approach to and treatment of various national repertoires.

As a library shelf search will quickly and decisively demonstrate, most general histories of Western art music--including Grout-Palisca's well-known and widely translated *A History of Western Music*, Fifth Edition, the first edition of which was published in 1960 and the music history I will discuss in some detail below--subscribe to the dictates of this originative German music-historic and music-historiographic institution. At every level, from the substantive to the superficial, the overall and indeed, overwhelming century-long conformity among music histories to this tradition leads one to conclude that there is but one art music-historiographic tradition, and a powerfully influential one at that. So much so that Dr. Charles Burney's notions of *real Music* and *artless music*, subsequently institutionalized by the Romantic disciplines of philosophical aesthetics and historical musicology, even today continue to determine not only pedagogical curricula and practices, but also to mould public perceptions of *Music* and *musics* in Canada and elsewhere.

In traditional music historiography, then, the repertoire of Ukrainian music--a

---

[9]Friedrich Blume, "Musical Scholarship Today," in Barry S. Brook, Edward O. B. Downs, and Sherman Van Solkema, eds., *Perspectives in Musicology*: The Inaugural Lectures of the Ph.D. Program in Music at the City University of New York (New York: W. W. Norton and Company Inc., 1972, 15-31), 17-19.

music which the discipline of historical musicology would more than likely deem "a matter for specialized studies"--would be allowed to "exist" only within the boundaries thrown up by the following two labels: nationalist and Russian. "Nationalist," like the current usage of "ethnic," differentiates and marginalizes;[10] that of "Russian" clearly misrepresents, and insofar as it obliterates Ukrainian music *per se* from the academic discipline of music history, it is, in effect, a *non*-representation. If the discipline of historical musicology, as presently constituted, were to acknowledge and represent nineteenth-century Ukrainian music, it would and could do so only within the frame inscribed by the nationalist label, and even then, indirectly.[11]

The principal task of this essay, however, is not to plead for either academic recognition or canonic legitimation of Ukrainian, or, indeed, of other so-called peripheral or similarly marginalized musics. It is, rather, "a way of starting in with a predicament";[12] to raise questions, and to argue for a closer and decidedly more

---

[10]Werner Sollers, "Ethnicity," in Frank Lentricchia and Thomas McLaughlin, eds., *Critical Terms for Literary Study* (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1990), 289, points out that nationalism and ethnicity are similar phenomena except that the latter "stresses territoriality."

[11]Indirectly, because at least until 1991 and the dismantling of the Soviet Union, the combination of prevailing Russocentric views in nineteenth- and twentieth-century Western scholarship, compounded by Ukraine's complex historical and political relationship with Tsarist and Soviet Russia ensured that Ukrainian music and its history--*if* acknowledged at all--could be represented only *as a sub-classification of*, or simply *as*, Russian music history. In any case, it is at least thrice-removed from the mainstream tradition of (unlabelled) music: national, Russian, Ukrainian.

[12]James Clifford, *The Predicament of Culture: Twentieth-Century Ethnography, Literature, and Art* (Cambridge, Massachusetts, and London, England: Harvard University Press, 1988), 3.

critical look at the ways in which traditional Western music-historical narrative represents peoples and their musics. It is an attempt "to dislodge the ground from which persons and groups securely represent others,"[13] and in doing so, to draw attention to music historiography's participation in and complicity with the very *processes* of marginalization or peripheralization.

The task, therefore, is to question some of the most fundamental aspects of the scholarly discourse[14] of historical musicology itself. What, for example, *is* the nature and function of traditional music-historiographic discourse? What are some of the fundamental epistemological assumptions, conceptual premises, and values informing this discourse: how, for example, does traditional music history interpret/construe its object, that is, the musical artifact? Does this interpretation or construal influence whose music history gets written and whose doesn't? In what way? What sort of narrative and/or rhetorical[15] strategies are engaged to preserve, communicate and justify these epistemological assumptions, premises, values, and/or plot choices? In other words, this essay is an attempt to examine

---

[13]James Clifford, "Introduction: Partial Truths," in James Clifford and George E. Marcus, eds., *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, California: University of California Press, 1986), 22.

[14]The term "discourse" here and throughout this essay is used in the sense used by Keith Jenkins, *Re-thinking History* (London and New York: Routledge, 1991), 71: a way of seeing history as a "field of force"; "a series of ways of organising the past by and for interested parties which always comes from somewhere and for some purpose . . . It is a field that variously includes and excludes, which centres and marginalises views of the past in ways and in degrees that refract the powers of those forwarding them. Using the term 'discourse', then, indicates that we know that history is never itself, is never said or read (articulated, expressed, discoursed) innocently, but that it is always for someone."

[15]Rhetorical in the sense that literature, history, and history-as-literature are all forms of writing and/or language-use; and as such, refers to language/writing as inextricably bound to specific socio-cultural, political, and institutional contexts.

aspects of both the "poetics"[16]--the rules, codes, and/or procedures that operate in the writing of a given set of, in this case, music-historical texts--and the ideological contexts that inform these poetics or practices.

As a way of focusing the approach to these indisputably complex and wide-ranging issues, I have chosen to investigate the concept of nationalism in traditional music historiography, its use as a *label* or *representation*, and its role in the mainstream/nationalist paradigm. Informing this investigation is the premise that the concept of nationalism-in-music as conventionally employed in the stylistic and/or analytic classification and description of nineteenth-century, predominantly East-European, musics is *not* the transparently music-specific and neutral label it appears to be.

It is, first of all, a form of language use, and insofar as "language is not an autonomous structure . . . its constraints are motivated by and tied to existing power relations."[17] The concept of nationalism is also an integral constituent of a thoroughly established and naturalized binary opposition, a traditional musicological narrative device into which, according to Don Michael Randel, much of "our discourse" is cast.[18] Deconstructive thinking holds that in such

---

[16]"Poetics" is a term used by Henry Kingsbury in "Sociological Factors in Musicological Poetics," *Ethnomusicology* 35/2 (Spring/Summer 1992): 195-219. Kingsbury discusses the sociological implications of musicological discourse by examining the "social configurations implicated in the rhetorical imagery of musicological discourse (195)."

[17]Donald M. Lowe, Review of Tzvetan Todorov, *The Conquest of America: The Question of the Other*, translated by Richard Howard (New York: Harper Colophon, 1984), *American Historical Review* 91 (April 1986): 494.

[18]Don Michael Randel, "The Canons in the Musicological Toolbox," in Katherine Bergeron and Philip V. Bohlman, eds., *Disciplining Music: Musicology and its Canons* (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1992, 10-22), 19.

oppositions, one term is always dominant, the other marginalized. It is important to remember, however, that the boundary, the "slash" separating the terms of an opposition, is neither fixed nor static. It is imminently permeable; and for Derrida, "always a potential site for conflict"[19] insofar as this hierarchy can be deconstructively reversed to allow the marginal, or so-called supplementary term to take on a kind of dominance. This reversal has two important effects: it reveals the inherent instability of the relationship between these two terms; and in doing so, undermines the rhetorical organization of a given text/discourse itself. This latter effect is important because

> to deconstruct a discourse is to show how it undermines the philosophy it asserts, or the hierarchical oppositions on which it relies, by identifying in the text the rhetorical operations that produce the supposed ground of argument, the key concept or premise.[20]

It is clear that, in this case, the concept of nationalism has been assigned to the marginal position within the mainstream/nationalist hierarchy. In addition to its subordinate status, the very fact that this concept needed to be *invented*--historiographically conceptualized--speaks to a strong extramusical engagement with issues in the larger socio-cultural and political arena. The concept's music-specific use, therefore, is the least, and I might add, the least convincing, of its various historiographic tasks; and tells us more about the practice of music historiography than about the music itself.

---

[19]Jacques Derrida, *Positions* (Paris: Minuit, 1972; English translation: Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981), 56-57/41, quoted in Jonathan Culler, *On Deconstruction: Theory and Criticism after Structuralism* (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1982), 85.

[20]Ibid., 86.

Consider, for example, the statement by Grout and Palisca that "nationalism as a force in nineteenth-century music is a complex phenomenon, the nature of which has often been distorted."[21] In spite of this nod to distortion--unexplained here, in any case--the authors nevertheless claim that nationalism figures prominently in the compositions of Borodin and Dvořák, whereas neither Wagner nor Verdi were "narrowly national" in the choice of subject matter, and so did not "[cultivate] a style that could be identified as ethnically German or Italian."[22] What sort of historical perspective generates and authorizes statements such as these? It is clear that there is more to this than meets the eye. Nationalism as movement *and* historiographic concept *is in itself a discourse,* one that has a history in the discourse of music history and other histories alike. The result of such discursive layering suggests that neither the concept as musicological tool, nor its historiographic use can be isolated from the ideology of nationalism pervasive in nineteenth-century socio-cultural and political thought generally.

Insofar as the specific task here involves the subversion of the mainstream/nationalist dichotomy, the investigation of the concept of nationalism in its music-historiographic context will be deconstructive in nature and intent. This is an approach which facilitates the exploration of the various forms of political activity at work between the representation "nationalist" and (1) the music "itself"-- mainstream and nationalist repertoires alike; (2) those doing the

---

[21]Donald J. Grout and Claude V. Palisca, *A History of Western Music*, Fourth Edition (New York and London: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc., 1988), 771.

[22]Ibid., 771-772.

representing; (3) those being or not being represented--all by way of demonstrating the instability and inadequacy of the concept of nationalism in its conventionally accepted use as a musicological category.

To this end, relevant sections from Donald J. Grout and Claude Palisca's *A History of Western Music*, Fifth Edition,[23] (and earlier editions where necessary), will be read deconstructively or "against the grain." This is a method of reading

> which does not take the texts' apparent contexts and intentions at face value, but *looks at the doubts they repress or leave unsaid* and how this repressed or "absent" element can undermine or undo what the text says.[24]

Such an approach to the reading of this music history text draws its rationale from Hayden White's argument that historical narratives are "verbal fictions, the contents of which are as much *invented* as *found* and the forms of which have more in common with their counterparts in literature than they have with those in the sciences."[25] In this view, then, historiography is a literary genre; and in its use of *language*--a socio-cultural product--music history, like any other literary text, is necessarily a socio-cultural and "inter-textual linguistic construct."[26] As a socially-situated practice, then, historiography is clearly a discourse--a system of

---

[23]Donald Jay Grout (Late of Cornell University) and Claude V. Palisca (Yale University), *A History of Western Music*, Fifth Edition (New York and London: W. W. Norton & Company, 1996).

[24]Gerald Graff, "Determinacy/Indeterminacy," in Frank Lentricchia and Thomas McLaughlin, eds., *Critical Terms for Literary Study* (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1990), 163-176. The emphasis here, as elsewhere in this essay, is mine unless otherwise indicated.

[25]Hayden White, "The Historical Text as Literary Artifact," in Hazard Adams and Leroy Searle, eds., *Critical Theory Since 1965* (Tallahassee: Florida State University Press, 1992), 396. Emphasis is White's.

[26]Keith Jenkins, *Re-thinking History* (London and New York: Routledge, 1991), 7.

knowledge or representation held together by a variety of conceptual premises with a social role: history is always written by someone for someone in response to a particular need. History, Keith Jenkins argues, "is never for itself; it is always for someone."[27] This is to say that "history remains inevitably a personal construct, a manifestation of the historian's perspective as a narrator"; it is, moreover, the way people or peoples "create in part their identities."[28]

Submitting the Grout-Palisca text to a close or deconstructive reading, then, is one way of examining the nature and function of traditional music-historical narratives in their conception as "stories . . . that the culture of ["Western civilization"] tells in its desire to affirm its identity and values."[29]

As to the "invisibility" of Ukrainian and other marginalized musics, there is no question that this is a complex and difficult problem. I do not pretend otherwise, nor do I propose an easy solution. I do believe, however, that the role of narrative representation in the phenomenon of historiographical invisibility must be interrogated. As the focus of such an interrogation, Ukrainian music and its history would provide a particularly useful example. Although a comprehensive case study is beyond the scope of this essay, I wish to suggest that even a brief investigation into the invisibility conditions of this or any such repertoire should demonstrate that music-historiographic discourse and its rhetorical constructs--the

---

[27]Ibid., 17.

[28]Ibid., 12 and 19.

[29]Leo Treitler, "Gender and Other Dualities of Music History," in Ruth A. Solie, ed., *Musicology and Difference: Gender and Sexuality in Music Scholarship* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press, 1993), 23.

concept of nationalism-in-music in this case--are inescapably textual and always interested.

Musicological discourse, then, is not simply a way of talking and writing about music; it is also, among other things, a way of marking and constituting difference. Legal scholar Martha Minow believes that

> we make a mistake when we assume that the categories we use for analysis just exist and simply sort our experiences, perceptions, and problems through them. When we identify one thing as like the others, we are not merely classifying the world; we are investing particular classifications with consequences and positioning ourselves in relation to those meanings. When we identify one thing as unlike the others, we are dividing the world; we use our language to exclude, to distinguish--to discriminate.[30]

The re-thinking of historiographic formulae, such as nationalism-in-music, for example, does not guarantee a given music repertoire historical inclusiveness, "visibility," or even the right to exist. It is, however, a good start insofar as it calls for the re-examination of music history's "storytelling" methods and the premises which inform these methods: the ways in which music historiography "classifies" the world of music and why. At the same time, re-thinking the traditional classification of nationalism necessarily begs the question: For whom, after Jenkins, is this story written? *Whose story is Western music history and how does this affect its telling?*

---

[30]Martha Minow, *Making All the Difference: Inclusion, Exclusion, and American Law* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1990), 3.

II The Concept of Nationalism in the History of Nineteenth-Century Music

> Nationalism is likely to be regarded as a convenient black box into which whatever cannot be explained in any other way--and in the literature this has always been a great deal--can be filed away without further consideration.
>
> James Mayall[1]

Definitional Problems and Functional Contradictions

Conventional music history appears to take the position that nationalism, an acknowledged "force in nineteenth-century music,"[2] is a useful, straightforward, perhaps even obvious music-descriptive and/or -critical concept. Even a random survey of the ML160 library shelves will attest to the concept's popularity, and indeed, to the high degree of consensus among music historians--past and present, prominent and less so--regarding its use as, at the very least, a stylistic label primarily for nineteenth-century East-European musics. Of these "nationalist" repertoires, the Russian is commonly perceived to be the most "successful." Why, then, is it necessary to investigate a notion both so familiar and historically legitimate?

A brief examination of "Nationalism" as defined in the 1986 edition of *The New Harvard Dictionary of Music*[3] is a good way to begin addressing this question,

---

[1]James Mayall, *Nationalism and International Society* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 5.

[2]Acknowledged in all but the fifth edition of the Grout and Grout-Palisca music history texts.

[3]Don Michael Randel, ed., *The New Harvard Dictionary of Music* (Cambridge and London: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1986), 527.

and at the same time, demonstrate why it needs to be asked.

> Nationalism. The use in art music of materials that are identifiably national or regional in character. These may include actual folk music, melodies or rhythms that merely recall folk music, and nonmusical programmatic elements drawn from national folklore, myth, or literature.

Up to this point, the meaning is clearly and narrowly aesthetic: it is music-centred, apparently inclusive, and generally unproblematic. It does not, however, remain so:

> This concept of musical nationalism *has* most often *been employed* to describe music of the later 19th and early 20th centuries *by composers from what were regarded as peripheral countries*. It *rests* in the main on the view that the music of *German-speaking countries, and to a lesser extent Italy and France, constitutes the central tradition of Western art music*. Nevertheless, much German music, especially of the Romantic period, *could* be understood as nationalistic in precisely this way.[4]

The definition continues with a list of countries and composers "most often mentioned under the heading of nationalism"--these include Russia, Czechoslovakia [sic], Norway, Finland, Spain, England, Hungary, and the United States--and points out that such examples could be "multiplied manyfold." The phenomenon of "nationalism" lost ground by the "middle third of the 20th century" as composers, "especially in the most influential cultural centers," turned to twelve-tone and serial techniques.

What are some of the issues raised here? To begin with, it is a mistake to speak of "musical nationalism" as a concept that "*has* . . . been employed" to describe and identify the musics of "peripheral" countries. A quick glance through

---

[4]Emphases here and throughout this essay are mine unless otherwise indicated.

even the most recent music histories and period studies will indicate not only the currency of this concept, but the stability of its tenure. Secondly, and more to the point, "musical nationalism," as a potentially comprehensive or universally applicable nineteenth-century compositional practice, undergoes here what can only be described as a historiographic transformation to become instead a boundary-marker. "Musical nationalism," as the practice of using "identifiably national or regional" musical and non-musical materials in the composition of presumably *all* late nineteenth-century and early twentieth-century art musics, is *historiographically* restricted to the representation of the compositional practices of a *particular* art music: that of countries previously designated "peripheral." The result is a not-so-implicit opposition of art music and "national" music; an opposition which, the definition states, "rests" on another one: the notion of a "central" German-French-Italian West-European art-music tradition versus a non-West-European, "peripheral" one.

Despite a somewhat grudging attempt to challenge and move away from these historiographic and geographic oppositions, the last sentence of the definition is, in many ways, the most problematic. A weak acknowledgement of musical nationalism's pan-European--specifically German--use is at the same time rejected: "much German music, especially of the Romantic period, could be understood as nationalistic in precisely this way." Yes, German music *could* be, but in keeping with Western music-historiographic conventions, it is not. This

yields a particularly "fuzzy" conclusion to a generally unsatisfactory definition of nationalism in music. It is interesting that Randel's 1978 version of "nationalism" in music is both more direct--that is, the conditional "could" has not been invoked--and more honest in its assessment of even the most current music-historiographic discursive practices:

> Although this idea also characterizes much of German musical romanticism beginning in the early 19th century, and although French and Italian music of the 19th and early 20th centuries often have clearly identifiable national elements, nationalism so called is usually regarded as a phenomenon in the music of "peripheral" nations seeking to throw off the domination of international styles, particularly those of German origin.[5]

In any case, "nationalism" as defined here is less a definition of nationalism in nineteenth-century music than it is a definition of music-historiographic practice. Carl Dahlhaus argues that national music should be defined in reference to its "function rather than its substance," and that "the national side of music" be sought "not just in its ethnic and melodic-rhythmic substance, but to a greater extent in a historical function in which aesthetic and political elements merge."[6] Dahlhaus, however, is still talking about the music. I suggest that the argument needs to be taken further; that its focus be redirected to the *historiographical* function of nationalism in music history.

It is clear that, as defined in Randel and, as I intend to show, in traditional music history writing overall, a serious contradiction plagues the definitional

---

[5]*The New Harvard Dictionary of Music*, 1978.

[6]Carl Dahlhaus, *Nineteenth-Century Music*, English translation by J. Bradford Robinson (Berkeley, Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1989), 39.

ground of nationalism. As a music-specific aesthetic concept, it is, and should be, straightforward and obvious. As a music-historiographic concept, however, it is less so. The consistently uneasy and unresolved relationship between nationalism-as-compositional-tool and nationalism-as-historiographic-concept indicates the concept's ongoing and inevitable historical intersection with things socio-cultural, political, and textual. Its historiographic use necessarily transgresses disciplinary boundaries--forces the concept into the extramusical realm--and, through rhetorical opposition, works to identify and establish difference on a multiplicity of levels in order "to exclude, to distinguish--to discriminate."[7] In order to come to terms with some of the reasons fuelling such narrative activity, the long-standing and naturalized historiographic legitimacy of this concept must be investigated and rethought.

The identification of nationalism as a historiographic, that is, narrative construct, and its selective, therefore problematic, attribution bring a number of serious questions to music-historical discourse: What then *is* "musical nationalism" in music historiography and what is its function? Why is it that only *some* music during an "age of nationalism" is found to exhibit properties of "musical nationalism"? Why the clear, if unstated, reluctance to associate the music of the German-French-Italian--especially the German--Western *core* with the label of "nationalism"? What, if any, is the significance of this West/East opposition?

---

[7]Martha Minow, *Making All the Difference: Inclusion, Exclusion, and American Law* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1990), 3.

Finally, does "nationalism" *as used* in the writing of music history refer at all to the *properties* of sounding and/or notated music? Or is it more likely--as I will argue--that "nationalism," in its role as a music-historiographic concept, is itself one of a number of "*discourses* constructed around concrete musical practices, and that those discourses group such practices into categories that render the music amenable to various forms of social, political, and economic control"?[8] If this is in fact the case, then nationalism is arguably *both* discourse and category: as "discourse," it meshes inextricably with the wider ideology(ies) of nationalism to inform and influence the very practice of writing music history; as "category," it establishes disciplinary boundaries to order musics, and so render them amenable to historiographic authority and control. Music history's use of nationalism may indeed resemble the "convenient black box" approach invoked in the epigraph above, a use which calls for the interrogation not only of the contents of this box, but also, and even more to the point, of that which has been left out of the box and why. I would like to suggest that investigating these issues will demonstrate that music history's specific use of nationalism makes sense *only* within the ideological frame that defines the discipline's discursive practices; and further, that the disciplinary restrictions placed upon the use of this concept are directed towards keeping this very frame and its informing aesthetic epistemology inviolate

---

[8]John Shepherd, "Difference and Power in Music," in Ruth A. Solie, ed., *Musicology and Difference: Gender and Sexuality in Music Scholarship* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press, 1993, 46-65), 49. The emphasis is Shepherd's.

and "pure." The aim of such protectionist activity may very well be, to paraphrase Leo Treitler, the production of a music-historical grand narrative which allows "Western civilization" to contemplate and present itself in a manner that affirms its preferred identity and values.[9] Such activity, however, also gives rise to a story charged with contradictions, a story grounded in dual constructions and the marking of oppositional and exclusional differences and boundaries.

I will analyze versions of this "story" for the purpose of discussing these and related issues in greater detail below; but first, I will briefly examine the interpretation of nationalism in other than music-historical contexts in order to provide an informational basis from which music history's specific use of nationalism can be compared and addressed.

Nationalism in Current Music-Historical Scholarship

Activity in the field of nationalism and ethnicity studies is at present especially brisk, the result of what the editors of a new reader on nationalism describe as the "explosion of ethno-nationalist sentiment and activity everywhere."[10] Although scholars from a variety of disciplines are contributing to this rapidly expanding field of learning--historians, anthropologists, political scientists, sociologists, philosophers, to name just a few--historical musicologists,

---

[9]Leo Treitler, "Gender and Other Dualities of Music History," in Ruth A. Solie, ed., *Musicology and Difference* (23-45), 23.

[10]John Hutchinson and Anthony D. Smith, eds., "Preface" in *Nationalism* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1994).

for the most part, are not. Michael Beckerman makes the observation that

> music historians are probably the only people left in the world who usually think in a benignly positive and uncritical way about nationalism. The issue has been richly problematized in many other fields, while music history textbooks continue to treat it with a kind of childlike faith, suggesting that "Russian" music, for example, "sounds" the way it does because of "nationalism."[11]

Although it is more likely an *appearance* of "childlike faith," the reasons for the discipline's reticence in this area are doubtless complex and many. In the opinion of Diamond and Witmer, musicology's avoidance of issues currently debated in the other humanities and social sciences derives primarily from its traditional status as "an academic discipline which has continued to give greater prominence to interpretations grounded in the 19th-century, Euro-centred belief in the autonomy of musical language."[12] The discipline, I might add, has from the outset afforded the language of music history a commensurate autonomy, a gesture which in itself begs investigation.

This is not to say, however, that music-historical scholarship has totally disregarded the issue of nationalism in music and music history. Carl Dahlhaus and David Beveridge, for example, have written to problematize the artificial barriers raised by the mainstream/nationalist paradigm. Dahlhaus points out that "the bourgeois nationalism of the nineteenth century was a pan-European

---

[11]Michael Beckerman, "The Master's Little Joke: Antonin Dvořák and the Mask of Nation," in Michael Beckerman, ed., *Dvořák and His World* (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1993, 134-154), 149.

[12]Beverley Diamond, "Introduction," in Beverley Diamond and Robert Witmer, eds., *Canadian Music: Issues of Hegemony and Identity* (Toronto: Canadian Scholar's Press, 1994), 1.

phenomenon," and therefore questions the "customary" approach "among students of the period to restrict the concept of musical nationalism to the so-called national schools, which consciously sought to separate themselves from the Italian, French, and German traditions and put themselves on an equal footing."[13] It is a restriction that, Dahlhaus claims, "does not really stand up to scrutiny." Having said this, however, he makes no attempt either to submit this restriction to closer scrutiny or to identify its historiographic parentage. Dahlhaus seems, rather, to be suggesting that *those so labelled* should take on the responsibility of re-thinking this label's use:

> It is precisely Russian, Czech, Hungarian and Norwegian historians of music who should be particularly sensitive about the concept of a "national school," for the very expression implies, tacitly but unmistakably, that "national" is an alternative to "universal" and that "universality" was the prerogative of the "central" musical nations. The term "national school" is a covert admission that the phenomenon it describes is peripheral.[14]

Following what appears to be the repression, if not outright abdication of historiographical responsibility, Dahlhaus distances himself (and, by implication, German music historiography) from the issue of nationalism still further by pointing out that "on the other hand, serious consideration should be given the possibility that the different manifestations of musical nationalism were affected by the types of political nationalism and the different stages in political evolution reached in each country."[15] Be that as it may, is this another way of saying that

---

[13]Carl Dahlhaus, *Between Romanticism and Modernism: Four Studies in the Music of the Later Nineteenth Century,* translated by Mary Whittall (Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press, 1980), 88-89.

[14]Ibid., 89.

musical nationalisms, too, are of two kinds: "central," therefore "universal," and "peripheral" (in the sense of a "less advanced" or "backward" stage of political evolution)?

Beveridge's article, "Dvořák's 'Dumka' and the Concept of Nationalism in Music Historiography," endorses Dahlhaus's position; and states that "of the many challenges posed to musicologists by the late Carl Dahlhaus, one of the most telling, and one that has yet to be fully addressed, concerns the concept of nationalism in accounts of the nineteenth century."[16] Beveridge also mentions Richard Taruskin and Michael Beckerman as two of the "few voices in America [who] have joined the call to reexamine attitudes toward nationalism."[17] From a slightly different perspective, Robert C. Ridenour[18] challenges the long-standing Western convention of grounding the work of the nineteenth-century Russian

---

[15]Ibid., 89.

[16]David Beveridge, "Dvořák's 'Dumka' and the Concept of Nationalism in Music Historiography," in *The Journal of Musicological Research* 12 (1993): 303-325.

[17]Michael Beckerman, "In Search of Czechness in Music," *19th-Century Music* 10/1 (Summer 1986): 61-73, asks a number of questions concerning so-called "national" elements in Czech and other "national styles," and points out that "although the question of 'national style' is often dealt with in a straightforward manner in both introductory and specialized works of music history, it is, in fact, riddled with the most puzzling assumptions and contains endless philosophical *culs-de-sac*" (61). See also, Beckerman's "The Master's Little Joke: Antonin Dvořák and the Mask of Nation," in Michael Beckerman, ed., *Dvořák and His World* (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1993), 134. Richard Taruskin makes a strong case for the need to re-think the history and historiography of Russian music as written and promulgated in the West. See, for example, "Some Thoughts on the History and Historiography of Russian Music," *The Journal of Musicology* 3 (1984): 321-39; and "How the Acorn Took Root: A Tale of Russia," *19th-Century Music* 6 (1982-83): 189-209. In a more recent article, "'Entoiling the Falconet': Russian musical orientalism in context," *Cambridge Opera Journal* 4/3 (November, 1992): 253-280, Taruskin discusses the irony inherent in the West's perception of what is really Russian "musical orientalism" as Russian "musical nationalism" (259).

[18]Robert C. Ridenour, *Nationalism, Modernism, and Personal Rivalry in 19th-Century Russian Music* (Ann Arbor, Michigan: UMI Research Press, 1981).

"Free Music School"--also known as the Balakirev circle, the "mighty handful" or "*moguchaia kuchka*"--in nationalist ambitions alone. He takes his argument beyond this traditional barrier of "nationalism" to point out the significance of contemporary aesthetic ideologies, such as realism and modernism, as well as personal and practical issues to the study of the music of this group.

Two more recent studies provide a refreshing and necessary change to the generally defensive and/or prescriptive--perhaps even static[19]--positions taken in the works just discussed. Approaching the issue of musical nationalism from "the other side," so to speak, Pamela Potter and Sanna Pederson explore, from different vantage points, the unequivocal role of musicology and certain of its tenets in the articulation of a German national identity.[20] A challenge to the established and generally comfortable view of nationalism in music and music-historical discourse, the work of these two scholars encourages, indeed, compels the asking of new questions. Pederson, for example, examines the institutional or extramusical aspects of the symphony and the symphony concert as a way of

---

[19]Static, because Western music scholarship continues to concern itself with the issues and concept of nationalism in music from a distance; as if to say that "nationalism is someone else's problem, but this is what we think should be done about it." I am suggesting that the issue of nationalism in music and music history might be better understood if scholars in the Western tradition were to take a closer look at their own historiographical practices and the way in which they themselves contribute to the maintenance and propagation of "musical" nationalism/s.

[20]Pamela Potter, "Musicology Under Hitler: New Sources in Context," in *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 49/1 (Spring 1996): 70-113. See also Potter, *Trends in German Musicology, 1918-1945: The Effects of Methodological, Ideological, and Institutional Change on the Writing of Music History* (Ph.D. Dissertation, Yale University, May 1991); Sanna Pederson, "A. B. Marx, Berlin Concert Life, and German National Identity," in *19th-Century Music* 18/2 (Fall 1994): 87-107, and "On the Task of the Music Historian: The Myth of the Symphony after Beethoven," in *repercussions* 2/2 (Fall 1993): 5-30.

focusing on the "nationalism inherent in the German theory of absolute music."[21] Potter, whose research focuses on the discipline of German musicology from the end of World War I through the fall of the Third Reich (1918-1945), speaks to the "ominous silence" surrounding the practice of musicology as a Germanocentric, nation-affirming activity; an approach, she argues, that "migrated to the United States with the victims of National Socialism, becoming an essential part of our own intellectual history."[22] A version of this "ominous silence" informs current North American music-historiographic and pedagogical practices overall,[23] manifesting itself at the local or narrative level through terms--like nationalism--which work simultaneously to inscribe identity and signal difference.

There is, then, some musicological interest in and concern with the music-historiographic use of "nationalism," but compared to the flurry of activity elsewhere, it is small and, save that by Potter, Pederson, and Beveridge, somewhat dated. It is also, for the most part, cautious. It is not enough to question the mainstream/nationalist paradigm, or the notion that nationalism constitutes the single driving force in the composition of nineteenth-century Russian and/or East-European music. The "challenge" thrown out by Dahlhaus is in itself guarded; it does not go the distance. Moreover, it is one that Dahlhaus himself does not take up. The challenge, as I see it, is this: unless and until the nationalism at work in

---

[21]Sanna Pederson, "A. B. Marx and Berlin Concert Life," 89.

[22]Pamela Potter, "Musicology Under Hitler," 107.

[23]Roger Rideout, "The German Model in Music Curricula," *College Music Symposium* 30/2 (Fall 1990): 106-111, speaks to this very issue.

preserving the central or mainstream tradition of Western music history and its principal tenets is identified, acknowledged, and discussed, the discipline's definition and application of musical nationalism will remain as "fuzzy" as ever.

If one accepts that "the roots of nationalism in the colonies [as in the music-historical "periphery," for example,] might be in the nationalism of their imperial [the mainstream] powers,"[24] then it can be posited that, in practical terms, the mainstream/nationalist paradigm is an opposition of nationalisms. "Mainstream" and "nationalist" musics are, then, two sides of the same coin: a "Janus-faced discourse of the [for the purposes of this discussion, German] nation"[25]--in short, two kinds of nationalism. It is simply that, in this case, the mainstream is doing the representing or naming, a naming which has the power to determine not only *what* will be known, but also *how* it will be known. This is possible because, in its conception as another nationalism, the mainstream can be said to constitute "quite specifically, the battery of discursive and representational practices which define, legitimate, or valorize a specific nation-state or individuals as members of a nation-state"[26]--or for that matter, a specific discipline and a specific group of scholars! Historical musicology is, in this way, narrating itself, producing and

---

[24]Kathryn A. Manzo, *Creating Boundaries: The Politics of Race and Nation* (Boulder and London: Lynne Rienner Publishers, Inc., 1996), 20.

[25]Homi K. Bhaba, "Introduction: narrating the nation," in Homi K. Bhaba, ed., *Nation and Narration* (London and New York: Routledge, 1990), 3. The very project of *Nation and Narration*, as stated here by Bhaba, is "to explore the Janus-faced ambivalence of language itself in the construction of the Janus-faced discourse of the nation" (3).

[26]Simon During, "Literature--Nationalism's Other? The Case for Revision," in Homi K. Bhaba, ed., *Nation and Narration* (138-153), 138.

affirming an appropriate historic-academic identity. It is also, and distinctly, as in the past, narrating a nation.[27]

For these very reasons, the so-called "musical nationalism" or "nationalistic music" of Western music history and historiography cannot be studied apart from the universally prevalent phenomenon or, better yet, phenomena of nationalisms.

Nationalism Beyond Musicology

Nationalism is, without a doubt, an emotionally charged word, a notion often thought of in critical, even negative, terms: a "pernicious doctrine," "an antiquarian irrelevance," "a baneful invention of some misguided German philosophers supported by the frustrations of obscure middle-class writers, low-born sons of artisans, farmers, and pastors," according to Elie Kedourie, an influential scholar and critic in the field of nationalism studies.[28] Anthony D. Smith[29] urges a more balanced view, one which would take into account the inspiring role nationalism has played in the field of culture, in the stabilizing of new regimes, in constitutional reform, and in the legitimation of social change and modernization, for example. Difficult and confusing to comprehend, universal yet

---

[27]I am using the terms "German nation" and "Germany" here in full cognizance of the fact that Germany as such was not a unified political entity until 1871.

[28]Anthony D. Smith, *Theories of Nationalism* (New York, Evanston, San Francisco, London: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1971), 9, discusses the views of Kedourie, a well-known scholar in the field, who believes that nationalism is not only "logically absurd," it is "profoundly subversive of all political order"; and because it confuses principles with interests, nationalism "introduces an extremist style into politics." A less severe, but similarly negative approach to musical nationalism seems to inform the writing of traditional Western music history.

[29]Ibid., 13-14.

necessarily and concretely particular, nationalism as a political phenomenon resists consensus concerning its identity, genesis, or future. Once the preserve of historians, the field of nationalism studies has become widely interdisciplinary. There is no doubt that current events, such as the unrest in Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union, European unity debates, minority questions in older and/or established Western states--Quebec in Canada, for example--are contributing factors here. These and other such events, in addition to the extensive immigration that has marked the twentieth century, have compelled nations everywhere to re-examine and redefine established notions of national identity. In fact, cultural critics from increasingly ethno-culturally heterogenous Western states are calling for the investigation of "how far the influx of *Gastarbeiter*, asylum seekers, and immigrants has furthered an everyday practical process of national reconstruction [and how it is] negotiating the more traditional, national, 'pedagogical' narratives of the nation in the old metropolitan centres."[30] The issue of "reconstruction" is clearly one which historical musicology, too, must begin to address at both the academic and national levels if it is to take its place as a relevant and responsible narrative within the necessarily continuous process of demographic redefinition at work within modern multi-ethnic states.

Influential as an ideology and movement from the time of the American and French Revolutions, nationalism first became a subject of historical enquiry and social scientific analysis in the mid-nineteenth and early twentieth centuries

---

[30]Ibid., 12.

respectively. However, it was not until after World War I, and especially since the 1960s, that nationalism was established as a subject of ongoing scholarly investigation. Intersecting as it does with numerous other subjects such as gender, immigration, race and racism, for example, the field of nationalist phenomena and its scholarly literature are vast and diverse. The forms nationalism itself can take--religious, conservative, liberal, fascist, cultural, political, separatist, to name just a few--are, in Anthony Smith's words, "kaleidoscopic." Although perennial definitional and theoretical debates further complicate this already very complex field, there is consensus on a number of points which I will outline briefly here.

Nationalism, in its conception as an ideology and political movement, asserts the right of a nation to independence and self-government. As such, it is described in most of the traditional literature as a peculiarly modern idea. Generally traced to the French Revolution and to subsequent reaction outside France against Napoleon's imperialism, it is an idea which became prevalent in Western Europe and North America during the second half of the eighteenth century, and in Latin America shortly thereafter. The term itself is variously equated with national sentiment, nationalist ideology and language, or nationalist movements. Most scholars agree that nationality or national identity is not biological and has little if anything to do with race. It is understood to derive from a sense of a shared or common culture, a notion of "shared time" in the form of historical or ancestral ties and myths, the occupation of a shared homeland or common territory, a common economy and common legal rights and

duties for all members.

Montserrat Guibernau distinguishes among three major explanatory approaches to nationalism,[31] the first and third of which are particularly relevant to this present discussion. The first is termed "essentialist" in that its focus is on the "immutable character of the nation . . . a natural, quasi-eternal entity created by God." Associated primarily with Herder and German Romanticism, this approach emphasizes the emotional and ideational, rather than the economic, social, and political aspects of community; and holds that every nation's role is embodied in its own unique language and culture: "*Denn* jedes *Volk ist Volk; es hat* seine *National Bildung wie* seine *Sprache.*"[32] Anthony Smith points out that in the hands of Fichte, Schlegel, Schleiermacher and others, this Romantically inspired form of nationalism became the German "organic version" of nationalism. Based on the principle that "nations possess 'the capacity to shape destiny by the historic workings of the national will,'"[33] this version, with Fichte's encouragement, wielded education as a "political instrument for injecting national spirit, 'a reliable

---

[31]Montserrat Guibernau, *Nationalisms: the Nation-State and Nationalism in the Twentieth Century* (Cambridge, UK: Polity Press/Blackwell Publishers Inc., 1996), 1-3.

[32]Johann Gottfried Herder, quoted in Aira Kemiläinen, *Nationalism: Problems Concerning the Word, the Concept and Classification* (Jyväskylä: Kustantajat Publishers, 1964), 40-41, n. 128, and again in Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (London: Verso, 1983), 66. The emphases, however, are Anderson's, who adds: "This splendidly *eng*-European conception of nation-ness as linked to a private-property language had wide influence in nineteenth-century Europe, and more narrowly, on subsequent theorizing about the nature of nationalism."

[33]Anthony D. Smith, *Theories of Nationalism*, quotes S. Baron, *Modern Nationalism and Religion* (New York 1960/1947), 17.

and deliberate art for fashioning in man a stable and infallible good will.'"[34] (It is important to keep in mind that it is this "Romantic" version of nationalism that was so influential in the shaping of national movements in Eastern Europe and the Middle East.)

The second approach mentioned by Guibernau considers nationalism within the various socio-economic contexts of modernism. From Ernest Gellner's influential and, for some, controversial perspective, nationalism is a purely functional response to the transformation of agrarian society to a world of industry and communication; a response elaborated through the spread of state-run education and communications systems. Tom Nairn, K. W. Deutsch and Elie Kedourie are some of the other scholars who bring a sociological and/or economic focus to this conception of nationalism.[35]

Concerned with issues of national identity and the emergence of national consciousness, the work of Anthony Smith and Benedict Anderson exemplifies the third approach to nationalism. Smith argues that among current collective cultural identities, national identity is by far the "most potent and durable influence."[36] Anderson joins the "what is a nation" definitional debates by

---

[34]Ibid., 16-17.

[35]Ernest Gellner is a prolific writer, and one who, according to Guibernau, "offers the most sophisticated account of nationalism within this framework." Some of Gellner's recent publications include *Encounters with Nationalism* (Blackwell: Oxford, 1994); *Postmodernism, Reason and Religion* (Routledge: London, 1992); "Nationalism and Politics in Eastern Europe," *New Left Review* no. 189, 1991; *Nations and Nationalism* (Basil and Blackwell: Oxford, 1983). Examples of work by the other scholars mentioned here include K. W. Deutsch, *National and Social Communication* (Massachusetts: The MIT Press, 1966/1953); E. Kedourie, *Nationalism* (London: Hutchinson University Library, 1986/1960), and Oxford: Blackwell Publishers: 1993); T. Nairn, *The Break-up of Britain* (London: New Left Books, 1977).

suggesting that the nation is an "imagined" political community, a purely modern construct. He argues that nationality, nation-ness, as well as nationalism, are "cultural artefacts of a particular kind";[37] and points to the importance of the printed word "as the basis or the emergence of national consciousness."[38]

Guibernau finds all three of these explanatory approaches deficient because not one succeeds, as he sees it, in merging the two fundamental attributes of nationalism: (1) a political ideology calling for the congruence of nation and state; (2) a provider of identity for individuals conscious of sharing a common culture, past, future, and territory.

I am not prepared to assess these approaches; I do, however, wish to point out that nowhere in my admittedly incomplete acquaintance with the field of nationalism have I encountered it as a delimited--East-European, for example--phenomenon. Earlier scholarship has gone so far as to distinguish between Western/good/positive and Eastern/bad/negative forms of nationalism,[39] but at no time has nationalism's all-encompassing nature been denied. I will also venture to say that perhaps music historiography's approach to nationalism, an approach sanctioned by the discipline of musicology and made available through

---

[36]Montserrat Guibernau, 3.

[37]Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (London: Verso Editions and NLB, 1983), 13.

[38]Montserrat Guibernau, 3.

[39]Two examples of this approach are: Hans Kohn, *Nationalism: Its Meaning and History* (Princeton, New Jersey: Van Nostrand, 1955), and John Plamenetz, "Two Types of Nationalism," in Eugene Kamenka, ed., *Nationalism: The Nature and Evolution of an Idea* (London: Edward Arnold, 1976).

music history surveys and other such widely accessible literature, *does* succeed in the kind of merging of nationalism's attributes called for by Guibernau above. Consider the author's claim that "symbols and rituals play a major role in the cultivation of a sense of solidarity among the members of a group."[40] Could it not be argued that the corpus of traditional Western music history is, indeed, such an identity-producing and identity-cultivating symbol? that it narrates, or attempts to narrate, the institutional solidarity of a particular group or groups at the levels of the academy and/or the nation-state? and that the very denial--implicit or otherwise--of such identity-affirming symbolic activities constitutes in fact the nation-inscribing, and therefore, the *political* attributes of "mainstream musical nationalism"? With these questions in mind, I would like to offer the following statement by Anthony Smith for serious consideration: "The history of nationalism is as much a history of its interlocutors as of the ideology and movement itself."[41] Eric Hobsbawm, in his inimitable fashion, expands on Smith's position here to spotlight--as will the remainder of this paper--a particularly relevant aspect of historiographic practice: the notion of history as a socio-politically determined and nation-affirming narrative *construction*:

> Historians are to nationalism what poppy-growers in Pakistan are to heroin-addicts: we supply the essential raw material for the market. Nations without a past are a contradiction in terms. What makes a nation *is* the past; *what justifies one nation against others is the past and historians are the people who*

---

[40]Montserrat Guibernau, 3.

[41]Anthony D. Smith, "Nationalism and the Historians," in Anthony D. Smith, ed., *Ethnicity and Nationalism* (Leiden, New York, Köln: E. J. Brill, 1992, 58-80), 58.

produce it. So my profession, which has always been mixed up in politics, becomes an essential component of nationalism.[42]

[42]Eric J. Hobsbawm, "Ethnicity and Nationalism in Europe Today," in Gopal Balakrishnan, ed., *Mapping the Nation*, introduced by Benedict Anderson (London and New York: Verso, 1996, 255-266), 255. The emphasis on the first 'is' is Hobsbawm's; the remaining emphases are mine.

III The Concept of Nationalism in Grout-Palisca's *A History of Western Music*, Fifth Edition

> When the German speaks of symphonies, he means Beethoven; the two names are for him one and indivisible--his joy, his pride. As Italy has its Naples, France its Revolution, England its Navy, etc., so the Germans have their Beethoven symphonies. The German forgets in his Beethoven that he has no school of painting; with Beethoven he imagines that he has reversed the fortunes of the battles that he lost to Napoleon; he even dares to place him on the same level with Shakespeare.
>
> Robert Schumann
> *On Music and Musicians*, 1839

If it is true that the history of nationalism is as much the history of its historians, and by extension, therefore, of their historiographic philosophy and practices, what then does the music history of Donald Jay Grout, together with Claude Palisca for the Third, Fourth, and Fifth Editions, teach us not only about nationalism in music, but more specifically, about the historiographic tradition of which these two historians are a part?

Before going on to answer these questions, however, two others must be addressed: Why is Grout-Palisca's *A History of Western Music*[1] the primary choice for analysis here? Is this pedagogically-intended, "honest and readable survey of the musical tradition we have known best"[2] an appropriate choice for an historiographic investigation such as this?

---

[1]Donald J. Grout and Claude V. Palisca, *A History of Western Music*, Fifth Edition (New York, London: W. W. Norton and Company, 1996).

[2]Claude V. Palisca, "Preface to the Fifth Edition," *A History of Western Music*, xi.

Although one might argue that the nature and role of *A History of Western Music* makes it unworthy of serious analysis, I would argue precisely the opposite. This text is a textbook survey of Western art music history; it is not a specialized or advanced study for specialists. Its main function is to serve as a teaching and learning resource for a reading audience of undergraduate students, and, therefore, presumed neophytes in the field of music history, and most certainly in the field of music historiography. But it is just such an "entry-level" or introductory (and for some readers, the first and only) music-history text that can and does wield the greatest influence amongst the greatest number of people, generation after generation, in the university and beyond. It does so through an accessible and assumed "ordinariness": through its use of "readable" or so-called "ordinary," as opposed to highly specialized and/or technical, language. Ordinary language-use draws its power from two sources. The first is from an apparent neutrality and naturalness, qualities which are inherent in and engendered by habitual use. As Thomas McLaughlin reminds us, the terms of ordinary language "do such good work for us that they make themselves invisible."[3] Such invisibility, however, discourages critical reading: it hides "a text's entanglement in language as a system of values," and masks the "framing and shaping power of [a language's] particular brand of common sense."[4] The second, and perhaps even

---

[3]Thomas McLaughlin, "Introduction," in Frank Lentricchia and Thomas McLaughlin, eds., *Critical Terms for Literary Study* (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1990, 1-8), 3.

[4]Ibid., 3.

more significant, source of power for the "ordinary language" of traditional music-historiography is that, although ordinary, it is couched in the authoritative cloak of professional discourse, and delivered by a voice--that of a teacher or an author--of and in authority. Protected and legitimized as it is by this authority, and disinterested as it pretends to be, however, professional discourse "is no more transparent a discourse than any other. It does not uncover reality, it merely represents the 'interests' . . . . As a discourse of entrenched power, it is conservative."[5]

"Entrenched" and "conservative," the Grout-Palisca version of professionalized music-historical "common sense" is also, to add another adjective, ubiquitous. The Fourth Edition (1988) of this text is the music history textbook I used as an undergraduate student of music here at the University of Alberta. It is, therefore, one with which I am most familiar; and, not insignificantly, a prime example of many such texts from whose context a large part of my personal musical experience is absent. Supplanted just last year by the Fifth Edition (1996), the Grout-Palisca text has been in use in this music department at least since 1989. Moreover, in a survey of 500 NASM-accredited[6] college and university music programs in the United States, 85% of 266 respondents reported

---

[5]Richard Taruskin, "Back to Whom? Neoclassicism as Ideology," *19th Century Music* 16/3 (Spring 1993: 286-302), 289, Review of Scott Messing, *Neoclassicism in Music: From the Genesis of the Concept through the Scoenberg/Stravinsky Polemic* (Ann Arbor and London: UMI Research Press, 1988).

[6]NASM is the acronym for The *National Association of Schools of Music* in the United States.

using the Grout-Palisca text alone or with supplements.[7]

The Grout-Palisca text is, in short, popular, widely used, perhaps even canonical; as a result, it is, without a doubt, as it has been for some thirty-seven years,[8] influential in the shaping of widespread music-historical notions.

A Descriptive Analysis

As the first step in the investigation of Grout and Palisca's version of nationalism in music and music history, I would like to make a few preliminary observations concerning the quantitative treatment of the topic of nationalism in the fifth-edition text; and, just to make a point, compare it with that of an arguably similar general history textbook, *Western Civilization: Since 1300*, Second Edition (1994),[9] by Jackson J. Spielvogel, as well as with earlier editions of the Grout-Palisca text itself.

What, for example, is the topic's place and order of appearance in the table of contents? How much space, in the form of pages and index references, has

---

[7]Mary DuPree, "Beyond Music in Western Civilization: Issues in Undergraduate Music History Literacy," *College Music Symposium* 30/2 (Fall 1990): 100-105. DuPree conducted this survey to trace the effect that knowledge of other musics--i.e., ethnic, American, women's, contemporary, etc.--was having, if any, on the European-music-from-the-Middle-Ages-to-the-mid-twentieth-century basics of historical knowledge for the undergraduate music history core requirements. The results showed that most programs use the Grout-Palisca text, many supplementing it with others: often Machlis's *Introduction to Contemporary Music*, or Cope's *New Directions in Music*, with one or more of the period studies in the Prentice Hall History of Music Series, or with a volume of source readings (101).

[8]The first edition was published in 1960.

[9]Jackson J. Spielvogel, *Western Civilization Since 1300*, Second Edition (Minneapolis/St.Paul, New York, Los Angeles, San Francisco: West Publishing Company, 1994, 1991). Spielvogel is associate professor of history at The Pennsylvania State University. By "similar," I mean that both texts are historical surveys, cover roughly the same time period in chronological narrative form, and are intended for undergraduate teaching purposes.

been allotted to this topic? (Obviously, for the sake of comparison, book size and other physical and publication details are factors to be considered here.) "Page-counting" as such may appear trivial, but, as Beverley Diamond, who conducted an analysis of Canadian music-history textbook narratives, pointed out, "the proportioning of space within . . . music textbooks indicates a number of priorities and deeply ingrained notions."[10]

Spielvogel devotes five chapters, 21 through 25, to a discussion of the nineteenth century. Chapter 22, entitled "Reaction, Revolution, and Romanticism, 1815-1850," identifies "Nationalism" (748-751), the third of five chapter subheadings, as one of the "The Ideologies of Change." The subject matter of Chapter 23, "An Age of Nationalism and Realism, 1850-1871" (776-812), is obvious. More to the point, however, is the fact that nationalism headlines this chapter to define and encompass an "age," and is treated as a phenomenon involving France, Italy, Germany, the Austrian (Austro-Hungarian, after 1867) Empire, Imperial Russia, Great Britain, and the United States: in other words, nineteenth-century Western and Eastern Europe and beyond. The index entries under the topic of nationalism are equally comprehensive in scope.

The Grout-Palisca fifth-edition text also devotes five chapters to a discussion of the nineteenth century, if Chapter 15, "Ludwig van Beethoven," is counted as

---

[10]Beverley Diamond, "Narratives in Canadian Music History," in Beverley Diamond and Robert Witmer, eds., *Canadian Music: Issues of Hegemony and Identity* (Toronto: Canadian Scholar's Press Inc., 1994, 139-171), 143.

the first of these. The words "Nineteenth Century" figure in the title of every one of the next three chapters, each of which is further distinguished either by the specific style period and/or genre classifications:

Chapter 16: "Romanticism and Nineteenth-Century Orchestral Music"

Chapter 17: "Solo, Chamber, and Vocal Music in the Nineteenth Century"

Chapter 18: "Opera and Music Drama in the Nineteenth Century"

Chapter 19, "European Music from the 1870s to World War I," lists the following subheadings: "The German Tradition"; "Nationalism"; "New Currents in France"; "Italian Opera"; and Bibliography.

How is "Nationalism" (665-677), in its first and only appearance in the table of contents, to be understood here? Is it a descriptive or defining feature of late nineteenth-century European musics overall? or is it rather, as it appears to be, an unidentified late nineteenth-century repertoire of music that is neither German, French, or Italian? The Revised (1973), Third (1980), and Fourth (1988) Editions organize this chapter in the same way except that it is titled "The End of an Era"; and "Nationalism" (Fourth Edition) or "Nationalism, Old and New: Russia" (Third, Revised, and Shorter Editions) is distinguished variously from "Post-Romanticism," "Richard Strauss," "Other Nations," "New Currents in France," and "Italian Opera" (which, in the Revised and Third Editions, is termed "Peripheries"!). Grout's Shorter Edition (1964) avoids the use of these summarizing categories, and provides instead an itemized list of contents which

includes, for example, names of individual composers and countries; specific genre or style designations; and specific work titles. It is clear, however, that the particular order and content of these items determined the naming and organization of categories in the later editions.

According to the table of contents, then, nationalism, in all but the 1964 editions, is not a concept associated with German, Italian, or French musics of the nineteenth century. It is perhaps significant that "Post-Romanticism," the subheading used in the first four editions, acquires, in the Fifth Edition, an ethnic identity to become instead "The German Tradition"; whereas, in the Fourth and Fifth Editions alike, "Nationalism" loses all three of its modifiers: "Old," "New," and "Russia." These changes, however, are cosmetic and local. They do not reflect changes within the body of the text itself, even though Palisca writes in his "Preface to the Fifth Edition" that the entire book has been rewritten "most drastically in the chapters from the eighteenth century on" (xii).

The Grout-Palisca index entries, however, appear somewhat broader in scope. Listed or referenced under the heading of "Nationalism" are "English music," "the French music revival," "Italian opera," "the rise and influence of nationalism in the Renaissance," "nationalism in twentieth-century music," "Romantic," and "late-" or "post-Romantic music." This latter category of late- or post-Romantic music constitutes the largest number of pages; and despite its title, (which, in the table of contents of the first four editions represented the music of "post-Romantic"

German composers--Wolf, Mahler, Strauss, and very briefly, Reger and Pfitzner), this "late-" or "post-Romantic" index reference actually refers in every edition to a section in the body of the text entitled "Nationalism." After a brief introduction, this section invariably begins with a discussion of music in Russia, and continues with a comparatively brief look at the music of a number of other West- and East-European countries--excepting Germany, France and Italy--and the United States (which, in the Fifth Edition, has been relocated to constitute the subject matter for all of Chapter 20).

Unlike the table of contents, the index references do associate French and Italian musics with nationalism; but *only* within separate sections devoted to that particular nation's music, and, as the body of the text will reveal, in a manner that tends to downplay or rationalize the existence of such nationalistic tendencies. Unassailably central in their music-historical legitimacy, these two repertoires are never discussed under the general heading of "Nationalism." German music alone is conspicuous in its absence from any sort of music-historical affiliation, general *or* specific, with nationalism. *If labelled at all*, it is consistently "Romantic," "musically Romantic," even "post-Romantic"; but this repertoire, unlike other "post-Romantic" repertoires between 1870 and 1914 and earlier, is not, one must assume, an exponent of nationalism in music.

Germany's "quantitative" absence here is not only historically untenable; it is a clear and significant contradiction of Spielvogel's and, by extension, of non-

music history's inclusive geo-political conception of nationalism in any of its nineteenth-century forms. Taking into account the fact that different varieties of history have different tasks to perform, how likely is it that nationalism in music and music history is an entirely different phenomenon from that in non-music history? or is it that music history emplots nationalism differently? In other words, if we accept that the nineteenth century was indeed an "age of nationalism," and that all late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century musics *could* be perceived in some way as national or nationalistic, have these two music historians simply chosen to tell the same story from a different point of view? a different story altogether? or only part of the story? In any case, as the subsequent textual analysis will attempt to demonstrate, the result is a history whose efforts to de-politicize--de-nationalize, in this instance--some music, while actively politicizing and nationalizing an/Other, reveal that story's own historical engagement with socio-cultural identity politics. Philip Bohlman speaks directly to such disciplinary maneuvers:

> The reason for [musicology's] imagined escape into a world without politics results from its essentializing of music itself. This act of essentializing music, the very attempt to depoliticize it, has become the most hegemonic form of politicizing music.[11]

Music historiography's aestheticization and conscious depoliticization of selected musics and their histories is at the very crux of the matter at hand. If today, as posited by Dr. Burney some 200 years ago, there exists the notion of a

---

[11]Philip V. Bohlman, "Musicology as a Political Act," *The Journal of Musicology* 11/4 (Fall 1993: 411-436), 419.

real Music and an/Other, in this case, a *National* music, it is the result of musicology's historiographic politics. Language, as argued earlier, is inextricably implicated in such imperialistically driven differencing procedures: imperialistic because, as Edward Said points out, the imperial dynamic manifests itself in its "separating, essentializing, dominating, and reactive tendencies."[12] As an institutionalized web of aesthetic and socio-cultural linguistic practices, the narrative of music history constitutes a body of knowledge that has the power to dominate, and, therefore, to marginalize.

Turning now to the body of the Grout-Palisca text, and in an admittedly re-contextualized but appropriate borrowing from Jean-François Lyotard's critique of totalizing narratives, "let us activate the differences."[13]

Two paragraphs introduce the seven-page discussion of "Nationalism" in Grout-Palisca's fifth-edition text (665-677). The first, curiously enough, begins the section with a consideration of a number of well-known composers and describes how, in fact, they were *not* exponents of a nationalistic music.

> Nationalism in nineteenth-century music was marked by an emphasis on literary and linguistic traditions, an interest in folklore, a large dose of patriotism, and a craving for independence and identity. A sense of pride in a language and its literature form part of the national consciousness that led to German and Italian unification. Up to a point, Wagner and Verdi chose

---

[12]Edward W. Said, *Culture and Imperialism* (New York: Vintage Books, 1994), 37.

[13]Jean-François Lyotard, *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge*, translated by G. Bennington and B. Masumi (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984, 81-82), quoted in Richard J. Bernstein, *The New Constellation: The Ethical-Political Horizons of Modernity/Postmodernity* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press, 1992), 313.

> subject matter that reflected their patriotic feelings, but neither one was narrowly national in this respect. Verdi, as we saw, became a symbol for national unity, but that was owing to the character of his operas. Neither of these composers cultivated a style that was ethnically German or Italian. Brahms aranged German folksongs and wrote folklike melodies. Haydn, Schubert, Schumann, Strauss, and Mahler all made conscious use of folk idioms, if not always those of their native countries. The Polish elements in Chopin and the Hungarian-gypsy traits in Liszt and Brahms were for the most part exotic accessories to cosmopolitan styles. Nationalism was not really an issue in the music of any of these composers.

Briefly then, every one of these prominent and, as it turns out, canonically sanctioned composers is linked to at least one of three aspects of nationalism in music: "literary and linguistic traditions"; a native or, alternatively, exotic "interest in folklore" expressed through the use of folksong idioms; and, if not a "large dose," at least a measure of "patriotic feeling." In every instance, however, there is a noticeable rhetorical distancing from, if not complete disclaimer of ethnic and/or nationalistic involvement: the choice of compositional subject matter by Wagner and Verdi was governed "*up to a point*" by patriotic feelings "*but*" neither one was "*narrowly* national in this respect"; Brahms, Liszt, Chopin and the other composers mentioned above made "conscious use" of native and others' folk idioms, "*but*" these were "for the most part *exotic accessories* to *cosmopolitan* styles." Grout and Palisca conclude, therefore, that "nationalism was not really an issue in the music of any of these composers."

What, then, does constitute "nationalism" here? and what does "not really an issue" mean? Does it mean that the composers mentioned above did not meet a prescribed quota in the compositional use of "their" national languages,

literatures, folk materials, and patriotic feelings? or does it mean that for music history these features are not in fact definitive aspects of nationalism in music? Furthermore, what is a "cosmopolitan" style, and is it to be construed in opposition to a "nationalistic" style?

The second paragraph, intentionally or otherwise, answers these questions for us:

> The search for an independent, native voice--one important aspect of nationalism--was keenest in England, France, the United States, Russia, and the countries of eastern Europe, where the dominance of German music was felt as a threat to home-grown musical creativity. Another factor in these lands was the ambition of composers to be recognized as the equals of those in the Austro-German orbit. By employing native folksongs and dances or imitating their musical character, composers could develop a style that had ethnic identity. Although individual composers in these countries differed in their interest in a nationalist agenda, it is convenient to deal with both nationalists and non-nationalists in this section.

Here, then, is what appears to be the Grout-Palisca definition of nationalism in music: it is a straightforward, defensive response from almost every West- and East-European country (except Italy) and the United States to the threat posed by the dominance of German music and the superiority of composers in the Austro-German orbit. Generated by the "search for an independent, native voice" and "the ambition of composers to be recognized as the equals of those in the Austro-German orbit," this response, as might be expected, consists of "employing native folksongs and dances" and imitations thereof. It is significant that for the purposes of this account, not only do these two factors seem to be exclusively definitive of nationalism in music, they are also undeniably extramusical and the

most (safely) political in nature. I say "political," because the alleged aim of such musically nationalistic activity was to "develop a style that had ethnic identity," and, in doing so, contribute to the construction of a cultural and/or national identity; and "safely," because the dominant tradition was not a historio*graphic* participant in such activities.

According to Grout-Palisca, then, it seems that the dominance of German music was responsible for the nationalist phase in music composition; and that as a phenomenon, nationalism in music was more a function of national and ethno-cultural politics than it was of aesthetics. This premise of German musical dominance, presented here quietly as a given, *ex nihilo*, clarifies somewhat a few problematic issues. First of all, presumably the possessors of an independent, native voice, and unequalled in the art of composition, German composers and their use of obviously national materials cannot be construed, as can the work of other nineteenth-century composers, as employing identity-seeking nationalism. The logic provided by this perspective justifies the previously noted absence of this repertoire from any categorical association with music-historical nationalism. This same logic, on the other hand, explains the overwhelming preponderance of German composers in this or any other historical discussion of nineteenth-century music. At a more practical level, it is this kind of thinking that works to reinforce and sustain the popular notion of a "mainstream" concert-music tradition and its transcendence of, among others, ethno-national and cultural identity concerns. As for the status of the first three aspects of nationalism in nineteenth-century

music--that is, language and literary traditions, folklore, and "patriotic" feelings--it seems that, despite their obvious affiliation with Herderian Romantic nationalism, they *are* accepted here as manifestations of nationalism in music, but *only* when associated with composers in pursuit of extra-aesthetic goals; and then *only* when these are pursued by composers threatened by and in opposition to Germany's musical dominance.

All this information concerning nationalist-others' feelings, intentions, and ambitions is presented here as self-evident; an omniscient "us/them" approach that might be rendered more acceptable were it accompanied with some sort of corroboration in the form of footnotes or at least an updated and more comprehensive bibliography--general histories and studies in nationalism included.[14] As it is presented, however, the Grout-Palisca approach to nationalism, or even "nationalism in music," comes across as out of touch with the history of nineteenth-century European, and specifically Germanic cultural and political nation-building activities. As a result, it is an approach that is historically abstract and reductive in the extreme. Thus severing, or at least sanitizing, music history's complex connections with its historical world denies it, in its conception as a literary work of art, its very "*worldliness*": that which, as Edward Said argues,

---

[14]Robert C. Ridenour's *Nationalism, Modernism, and Personal Rivalry in 19th-Century Music* (Ann Arbor, Michigan: UMI Research Press, 1981) is the only "critical" work cited in the Bibliography under "Nationalism: Russia" (689). All the other entries under this and other country headings, including France and Italy, consist primarily of history surveys and "man and his work" listings.

makes it "*more* interesting and *more* valuable as [a work] of art."[15]

The two short paragraphs quoted above, the equivalent of a half page in this fifth-edition text, and the premise of dominance on which they turn, raise numerous historiographic issues. Compare, for instance, the text's handling of the remainder of this section on "Nationalism" with the five chapters (15-19) devoted to nineteenth-century music overall. Best described as "peripheral"--the term used in *The New Harvard Dictionary of Music* to describe the historiographical conceptualization of non-Austro-German composers--Grout-Palisca's appendix-like, twelve-page treatment of the music of some *nine* nations is in stark contrast to the Germanic cast of these five chapters. The effect is to activate the ever-present dominant/peripheral or mainstream/nationalist paradigm whose problematic influence on the spatial and narrative parameters of these five chapters is unmistakable.

Russia is not the first country mentioned in the Grout-Palisca list of nationalistic countries above; but, as is conventional in Western music histories, this country, in addition to being allotted the most space (six and one-half pages here), is always the first to be discussed. Of all the composers discussed in the "Nationalism" section, Musorgsky receives the most coverage. Glinka, Dargomïzhsky, and Tchaikovsky receive between five to eight lines each; "Rimsky-Korsakov and Others"--that is, Glazunov and Rakhmaninov--about a page;

---

[15]Edward W. Said, *Culture and Imperialism*, 13. Said's emphases.

Skryabin, a half-page; and about a page for the inevitable but cursory discussion of "The Mighty Handful." "Central Europe," with a focus on Smetana, Dvořák, and Janáček is next, followed by Norway: Grieg; "Other Countries": Poland, Denmark, Netherlands; Finland: Sibelius; England: Elgar; and Spain: Pedrell, Falla. Finland/Sibelius is allotted one and one-half pages; the others more or less a half-page each.

What is the status accorded this section within nineteenth-century music overall? A brief overview of its textual context may suggest that "peripheral" is too generous a description.

"Leadership in European music passed over to Germany at the beginning of the 19th century, by virtue of these three masters," writes Alfred Einstein, referring to Mozart, Haydn, and of course, Beethoven; and it is from their "highly individual works" that the "conception of 'German music' was derived."[16] Palisca does not use these words, but there is no doubt that he is bound by them and the tradition from which they proceed. Preceded by a chapter on Haydn and Mozart, whose "music represents the best that period produced" (529), Chapter 15 (533-562) is devoted entirely to "Ludwig van Beethoven." Chapters 16 through 18 deal with the genres of nineteenth-century music: orchestral music; solo, chamber, and

---

[16]Alfred Einstein, *Music in the Romantic Era: A History of Musical Thought in the 19th Century* (New York, London: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc., 1947), 293. As a point of interest, these quotes are taken from a chapter entitled "Nationalism," but despite a "democratic" introduction, Einstein attributes the process of nationalization in music to an appearance of "new, smaller, regional, often only provincial musical divinities" beside the altars of "universal gods," i.e. Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven (296).

vocal music; opera and music drama, respectively. Although the chapter headings are non-specific and seemingly inclusive, the focus of these three chapters, save the one on opera, is primarily on the work of German composers or composers with Germanic names in these genres.

Beginning with a short discussion about the notion of Romanticism, the breakdown for the chapter on orchestral music, for example, looks like this:

I. ROMANTICISM 563-565

II. ORCHESTRAL MUSIC 565-587

1. The Beethoven Legacy: 565-567

   Schubert, Berlioz, Schumann, Mendelssohn, Brahms, Wagner, Bruckner.

2. Schubert . . . . . 3.3 pages
3. Mendelssohn 2.5
4. Berlioz 2.5
5. Schumann 0.5
6. Liszt 3.3
7. Brahms 3.0
8. Bruckner 2.0
9. Tchaikovsky 1.0
10. Dvořák 0.3

(Number of pages cited are approximations.)

Tchaikovsky is introduced as "the *Russian* Piotr Il'yich Tchaikovsky": no other composer's ethnicity or nationality is pointed out in this way.

The next chapter assumes a similar profile. The familiar Germanic and thoroughly canonized "foreign" composers--Chopin and Liszt--dominate the discussion of "Music for the Piano," "Chamber Music," and "The Lied." However, three "Bohemians," well-known and influential early Romantic pianists and composers, are mentioned briefly at the beginning of the section; while "two Russian works" by contemporaries of Brahms, Modest Musorgsky and Mily Balakirev, merit a line each at the end of the piano section as "Other Composers" which, in any case, is devoted primarily to César Franck--a composer involved, among other things, in the national revival of French music in 1871. The short section on "Choral Music" is distributed among German, French, and Italian composers, although Russian church music and the Romantic oratorio in Protestant England receive a few lines each. Overall, composers from the so-called nationalist countries are either discussed last, as are Tchaikovsky, Dvořák, and Franck; very briefly, as are, again, Dvořák, Musorgsky, and Balakirev; as a collectivity, not as individuals: "Bohemians," "Other Composers," "Russian church music," for example; or not at all.

Chapter 18, "Opera and Music Drama in the Nineteenth Century," is given over entirely to France, Italy, and Germany, in that order; page allocation reverses that order with Wagner receiving top billing, Verdi a close second, followed by Weber and Berlioz. German dominance continues into Chapter 19 which opens with a fourteen-page section on "The German Tradition"--"Post-Romanticism" in

earlier editions--which deals with Wolf and his songs; Mahler; Richard Strauss; and very briefly, Humperdinck, Reger, and Pfitzner. "Nationalism," "New Currents in France," and "Italian Opera" complete the chapter, and for the purposes of this text, the nineteenth century. *Verismo*, Puccini, Mascagni and Leoncavallo merit barely a half-page, France ten pages, and everyone else, the aforementioned twelve. So-called "National Opera," even in its better known and currently performed nineteenth-century manifestations is not--as might be expected in a 1996 publication--included here.

It is very tempting to ask, at this point, why the authors felt compelled to include this twelve-page section on "Nationalism" at all. Apart from Netherlands, England, and only sporadically Spain and "Bohemia," not one of these musics has played much of a role in this story from the beginning. A look at the index reference "Russia" or "Finland," for example, indicates that neither of the musics of these two countries "existed" until the nineteenth century. There is another way to look at this, however. According to Palisca's account of nationalism, Germany as the dominant musical force in nineteenth-century Europe was not engaged in identity-seeking activity of any kind. An established music-historical nation, its repertoire constituted, as it continues to do today, the mainstream of Western music. Therefore, not only can this music-historical treatment be read as a textual, and perhaps even an historico-political marginalization of these "other" countries and their musics in the service of preserving this premise of dominance,

it is above all a clear and outright marginalization of the notion of nationalism and everything it stands for in music, music history, and music-historiography itself. Consider the fact that German music is the only repertoire left "untainted" by nationalism at the end of this five-chapter discussion of nineteenth-century music. This in itself is not only historically untenable; it is evidence of another kind of identity-seeking nationalism. It is often argued that "German national sentiment" was considered unusual insofar as it "existed in a cultural form long before it found political expression."[17] This in no way renders it any less a form of nationalism and/or an identity-seeking mechanism. (In any case, its political version was also well in place long before the last quarter of the nineteenth century.)

However, it must be remembered that nationalism is not the simple, monolithic phenomenon presented here by Grout-Palisca, that "each nation's nationalism is unique and has distinctive features and that it can exist simultaneously in many different manifestations in a single society"; and that, as was the case in Germany during this period, "German nationalism was not one but several different movements."[18] As I have suggested earlier, Western music history, especially that of this period, is effectively a narration of the German

---

[17]Michael Hughes, *Nationalism and Society: Germany 1800-1945* (London: Edward Arnold, 1988), 12. Further to this, Hughes considers the argument of some historians that Germany "became political too late," and as a result, "many nationalists in the nineteenth century, including Liberal nationalists, saw Germany as a delayed or retarded nation and it is argued that this produced in the later nineteenth century a kind of collective sense of inferiority and a constant need to catch up and overtake other nations" (12).

[18]Ibid., 15.

nation: "The power to narrate, or to block other narratives from forming and emerging," Said reminds us, "is very important to culture and imperialism, and constitutes one of the connections between them."[19] This tendency to imperialism, its efforts to differentiate between "us" and "them," is as much an identity-seeking exercise as any other. Indeed, confirmed and reinforced by the inclusion and, at the same time, the peripheralization of this twelve-page wedge of text, the workings of this exercise force the subversion of the mainstream/nationalist binary opposition. It is a reversal which produces two important effects: it demonstrates how these two terms, although set in opposition to one another, mutually implicate one another; it foregrounds the notion of nationalism, highlighting the "discordant signifying elements that the text has thrown into its shadows or margins."[20] In other words, the text effectively questions and destabilizes its own boundary-fixing procedures; it deconstructs itself.

A Deconstructive Reading

> Cheating in history consists of speaking of oneself while feigning to speak of others.
> Jean-François Revel, 1968[21]

How, then, does the Grout-Palisca fifth-edition text proceed to "deconstruct"

---

[19]Edward W. Said, *Culture and Imperialism*, xiii.

[20]Barbara Johnson, *A World of Difference* (Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1987), 17-18.

[21]Jean-François Revel, *Histoire de la philosophie occidentale* (Paris: Stock, 1968), quoted in Roy Preiswerk and Dominique Perot, *Ethnocentrism and History: Africa, Asia and Indian America in Western Textbooks* (New York, London, Lagos: Nok Publishers International Ltd., 1978), 105.

itself? Where are its "discordances," and what sort of rhetorical maneuvers has it employed to throw these "into its shadows"? To what extent have these maneuvers succeeded? And finally, to put it bluntly, why does the discourse of traditional music history work so hard to disassociate itself and its primary object of study--nineteenth-century German music--from the concept of nationalism in music?

I intend to explore two "textual" dimensions in order to deal with these questions. Notwithstanding the necessarily local nature of the deconstructive process at one level, this process, at another, posits, to quote Jacques Derrida, "*il n'y a pas de hors texte*":[22] there is no outside to a text, all is text. In addition to examining new and already discussed portions of the fifth-edition text, therefore, I will turn as required to other discourses which inevitably intersect and overlap with the discourse at hand.

The text's "discordances"--those elements which the text not only hides or misplaces, but also those which it represses, omits, or, in some instances, even falsifies--occur in a number of different, but related and perpetually intersecting, textual situations wherein the rhetorical disclaimer of nationalism falters or collapses completely. One example is where the text undertakes considerable verbal and spatial gymnastics to distance a preferred repertoire of music from the phenomenon of nationalism, simultaneously and inevitably tripping itself up with

---

[22]Christopher Norris and Andrew Benjamin, *What is Deconstruction?* (London: Academy Editions, 1988), 20.

information offered elsewhere in the same, or other text/s. Another occurs where the text intensifies its distancing efforts to the extent that its discussion of a given composer or repertoire is completely enclosed in protective rhetoric. In this case the distancing takes the form of repression or outright omission of incriminating or corroborating information to focus instead on work-immanent commentary. This multidimensional act of distancing, reinforced by the perfunctory and already marginalized treatment of nationalism and those countries linked to nationalism, has the effect of compounding nationalism-in-music's already negative or, at the very least, undesirable and "to-be-avoided" status.

I will consider a few examples from the text to demonstrate how these various "distancing" procedures are carried out, and indicate how they differ in their respective treatments of the favoured repertoires: the Italian, French and German.

The first paragraph of the "Nationalism" section (page 666 in the text and presented in full above) provides one of the more blatant examples of this sort of self-subverting rhetorical activity. The nineteenth century is generally acknowledged as an age of nationalism, a phenomenon that in its various manifestations influenced every aspect of contemporary life, the arts included. Yet Grout-Palisca assert that "nationalism was not really an issue in the music" of Wagner and Verdi, for example. The text states that the subject matter of these two composers "reflected their patriotic feelings, but neither one was narrowly national in this respect"; and further, that "neither of these composers cultivated a

style that was ethnically German or Italian." Insofar as the issue here is "subject matter" arising from a nationally specific language and literature, this is not the place to a offer an account of the nation-building process--and the varieties of nationalism concomitant with it--in the territories that by 1870 and 1871 became Italy and Germany; nor will I attempt to demonstrate the considerable socio-cultural and political engagement of these two composers. One need only take note that Wagner is described elsewhere as the man who "in a period when Germany was still a congeries of petty states . . . addressed himself to the German nation as the prophet and celebrant of its future greatness";[23] that Verdi's name served as a rallying cry for Italian patriots, *or*, and even more to the point, that opera is rooted in an *Italian* Renaissance tradition: "by 'birth, ancestry, and general outlook on life,' opera is Italian."[24] The genre is Italian by definition and, within that country and beyond, was not obliged to share the stage with other national opera types, German and French included, until well into the nineteenth century. Grout and Palisca present this information considerably more obliquely, but in a way that seems to justify, at least in part, the five-chapter concentration on nineteenth-century German music genres: "Opera was the only important Italian musical outlet in this period, so that the genius of the nation was largely concentrated on this one genre" (630).

---

[23]Albert Goldman and Evert Sprinchorn, "Introduction" to Richard Wagner, *On Music and Drama*, translated by H. Ashton Ellis (Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press, 1992), 11.

[24]Ida Donata Liberkowski, *Ethnicity and Italian Opera: A Processual Analysis of the Ethnic Expression in the Performing Arts* (Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 1983), 2.

In the section devoted to Verdi, his career is touted as constituting "practically by itself the history of Italian music for the fifty years following Donizetti," and in outright contradiction of the statement in the "Nationalism" section, it seems that nationalism was indeed an issue in this composer's work:

> The only Romantic issue that much affected Italian music was nationalism, and there Verdi was uncompromising. He believed wholeheartedly that each nation should cultivate its native music. He maintained a resolute independence in his own musical style and deplored the influence of foreign (especially German) ideas in the work of his younger compatriots. Many of his early operas contain choruses that were inflammatory, thinly disguised appeals to his compatriots struggling for national unity and against foreign domination during the stirring years of the *Risorgimento* (national rebirth).

In light of this, and despite the fact that Verdi's librettists *adapted* the work of a number of non-native, that is, non-Italian, Romantic authors--Schiller, Hugo, Dumas the Younger, Byron, and Scribe--to be sung *in Italian*, is it still plausible to argue that nationalism, defined by the authors themselves as "the search for an independent, native voice," was *not* an issue in Verdi's work?

It must be remembered, however, that music historiography is less protective of the Italian repertoire than it is of the German. Philip Gossett recently criticized the nature of the dialogue now emerging between musicology and Italian opera, "a dialogue in which both scholarly imperialism and nationalism (or even racism) figure prominently, if not always explicitly."[25] Long regarded as

---

[25]Philip Gossett, "History and Works That Have No History: Reviving Rossini's Neapolitan Operas," in Katherine Bergeron and Philip V. Bohlman, eds., *Disciplining Music: Musicology and its Canons* (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1992, 95-113), 108.

"peripheral and frivolous," Italian Ottocento opera has only within the last twenty years been accepted for "canonic" musicological study, and then in a manner that Gossett claims smacks of "traditional imperialism": "scholarship appropriated Italian opera without inventing 'new methods appropriate for its study.'"[26] Nevertheless, as marginal to the musicological canon as Italian opera is or may have been, and as nationalistic in intent (or content) as much of this repertoire was, Italian music in general, an acknowledged music-historical constituent of the mainstream, is not explicitly associated with the *category* or label of nationalism here. This music's nationalistic features are openly discussed, as we have just seen here in the person of Verdi; but always on its own terms and in its own space--it is separate from the "real" phenomenon of nationalism discussed in Chapter 19. Separate, I suggest, for a number of obviously important reasons: Verdi's incontestable ownership of the history of Italian music for some fifty years (633); Italy's "long, unbroken operatic tradition," a tradition so popular in Europe (Germany included) and North America during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries that it cannot be denied or swept into the margins; and, perhaps the most significant of all, the mention of Beethoven's influence, the composer "whom [Verdi] revered above all composers" (634). As Grout-Palisca point out, although a "profound national trait was revealed in Verdi's treatment of opera as human drama [in contrast to the Germans' emphasis on romanticized nature and

---

[26]Ibid., 108.

mythological symbolism]," his "independence was not, of course, absolute" (634).

The significance of this indebtedness must not be underestimated: Verdi is distanced, but not excluded from the dominant stream. Note, however, that this is a very compromised sort of inclusion and best exemplified in the authors' summation of this composer's work (638). There is no mention of international or far-reaching "influence," nor any suggestion of universalism in the sense of transcending the particular or the local. In fact, Verdian opera, sole repository of nineteenth-century Italian music, is described here as a "combination of primitive, earthy, elemental emotional force"; and together with its human interest and unsentimental treatment of nature, as compared with the worshipful one of the "northern Romantics," it was truly grounded and, moreover, very different from the remote otherworldliness of German Romantic opera of the time.

Compare this only somewhat "distanced," but distinctly ethno-nationalistic Italian composer with a composer music-historically "categorized" as such. Musorgsky and the other members of "The Mighty Handful" "felt alienated" from the St. Petersburg Conservatory, a German-influenced institution. Apart from a noted admiration for Western music (667), Musorgsky was not, according to Grout-Palisca, otherwise indebted to the mainstream; he was, rather, "highly original, and indeed revolutionary (670)." His influence, moreover, is limited to "exotic accessories": the introduction of Russian folksong modality into the "general musical language," and the attraction of his "nonfunctional harmonic

progressions" for Debussy (668). Musorgsky's musical independence from the mainstream is posited as absolute; it is, therefore, construed as nationalistic.

Robert Ridenour's discussion of *Nationalism, Modernism, and Personal Rivalry in Nineteenth-Century Russian Music*[27] thoroughly dispells this notion of independence, as does the quote from César Cui of *The Mighty Handful* on page 667 of the Grout-Palisca text itself, a quote which includes a long list of Western composers that the group studied and knew well. It is ironic, by the way, that Grout-Palisca take this quote from Richard Taruskin's article, "Some Thoughts on the History and Historiography of Russian Music," the very thesis of which criticizes Western music historiography's facile identification of Russian music with the concept of nationalism as unexamined and indicative of a prejudicial laziness. The article is identified, of course, but is not included in the Bibliography at the end of Chapter 19.

Unlike Italy, France *is* mentioned in the introduction to "Nationalism" on page 666 as one of the countries where "the dominance of German music was felt as a threat to home-grown musical creativity." This information, however, is neither repeated nor expanded upon in the section devoted to post-1870 French music, "New Currents in France," a music and a section of text distanced even further from the notion of nationalism than is Italian music. The heading "New Currents in France" (677), equal in size and prominence to that of "Nationalism,"

---

[27]Robert C. Ridenour, *Nationalism, Modernism, and Personal Rivalry in Nineteenth-Century Russian Music* (Ann Arbor, Michigan: UMI Research Press, 1981).

is further set off from the latter by a section-marking logo. A trivial observation perhaps, but a convincing textual maneuver nonetheless: late nineteenth-century French music may be nationalistic, as the ensuing discussion amply proves, but it is not nationalistic in the way that presumably Russia, Eastern Europe, and the others are. The text itself testifies to the artificiality of this separation.

The rhetoric, first of all, is couched not only in cautious, but deferent terminology. Nationalism in French music was aimed at "the *recovery* of [France's] national musical heritage and the encouragement of its native composers" (677). The task of "recovery" consisted of sponsoring performances of the music of French composers and *reviving* "the great French music of the past" (677), a task undertaken by the *National Society for French Music,* founded, not insignificantly, in 1871 in the aftermath of the Franco-Prussian War. These renaissance-driven activities succeeded in allowing France "to *regain* a leading position in music in the first half of the twentieth century," and, more importantly, to transcend the particular: "the French revival, begun as elsewhere with nationalistic aims produced results of prime importance *for Western music*" (677), an example of what Alfred Einstein might have termed "universalism within the national."[28]

---

[28]Alfred Einstein, *Music in the Romantic Era*, entitles Chapters 15 and 16 of his text "Universalism within the National--I. Literature of the Piano" and "Universalism within the National--II. Neo-Romantic Opera" respectively. These chapters discuss the work of Mendelssohn, Schumann, Liszt, Chopin and Brahms; and Wagner and "Those in Wagner's Shadow"; French Opera; Italian Opera; and Offenbach. These are followed, in the usual pattern, by Chapter 17 "Nationalism." The difference here is that Bohemia, not Russia, is the first to be discussed after the introduction.

Grout-Palisca, then, acknowledge France's nationalistic activities; but, in view of the music's past prestige--this is *not* a newly-formed musical institution--and its renewed and universal importance for Western music, they avoid *categorizing* it as nationalist. This is a strategy that, at the same time, avoids compromising or otherwise sullying the aesthetic autonomy of the French repertoire any further.

It goes without saying that French nineteenth-century nationalism in music was not limited to the reclamation of Rameau, Gluck, and the sixteenth-century composers, or to the desire to popularize the nation's contemporary French composers. Before the Franco-Prussian War, German works dominated performances of orchestral and chamber compositions to the extent that, for French composers, "the nineteenth century appeared to be a vast lacuna in their musical tradition and that the era more aptly characterized its most cherished icons in Germanic terms."[29] Post-war anti-German sentiment in French musical life was exacerbated by the immeasurable influence of Wagner and Wagnerism on the one hand, and, in Debussy's words, "the neo-Beethovenian formulae bequeathed by Brahms"[30] on the other. Scott Messing states that in response to an "increasingly vociferous nationalism, [French artists] were drawn to their preromantic past which was *construed* to embody a purity inherent in their race."[31]

On the other side of this was without a doubt a seriously wounded cultural

---

[29]Scott Messing, *Neoclassicism in Music: From the Genesis of the Concept through the Schoenberg/Stravinsky Polemic* (Ann Arbor and London: UMI Research Press, 1988), 24.

[30]Ibid., 24.

[31]Ibid., 24. My emphasis.

and national pride. French hegemony in the socio-cultural and political affairs of Germany and much of Europe and Russia up to this point in time is well documented. Consider only the nature of the special historiographic mission assumed by Michelet (1798-1874) and other French Romantic historians: "Paris speaks for France; France speaks for Europe and the modern world";[32] and more explicitly, in Michelet's own words, "every social and intellectual solution is sterile for Europe until France interprets, translates, and popularizes it . . . . France speaks the logos of Europe, as Greece once spoke that of Asia."[33] For these historians, Germany was France's Other, her "East," the "India of Europe," as Michelet described it; "the French . . . saw themselves as the interpreters of Germany to the world."[34] Germany's assumption of musical dominance at the beginning of the nineteenth century, then, constitutes in no small way material for that country's decided search for, and construction of, an ethno-national identity. Taken up and institutionalized by contemporary music-aesthetic journalism--as practiced by E. T. A. Hoffman, Robert Schumann, A. B. Marx, and Eduard Hanslick, to name just a few--this premise of musical dominance has served to this day as a powerfully influential music-historiographical norm, a norm all the more

---

[32]Lionel Gossman, "History as Decipherment: Romantic Historiography and the Discovery of the Other," *New Literary History* 18/1 (Autumn 1986: 23-57), 43.

[33]Ibid., 30. Gossman quotes Michelet, *Introduction à l'histoire universelle*, 156.

[34]Ibid., 29. Germany was perceived as the "India of Europe" in the sense that "of all Western lands [Germany was] the one that had best preserved the innocence and simplicity of childhood origins and that therefore best represented in modern times the sacred wisdom and unity of the East." Gossman states that this idea was fairly common at the time. According to August-Wilhelm Schlegel in 1804, "Germany must be considered the Orient of Europe." (53n.)

influential because unspoken.

In view of France's prominence in Western music history and history overall, then, Grout-Palisca approach the discussion of the so-called "New Currents" in French music from 1871 to the early nineteen-hundreds with some care, or, to put it another way, semantic evasion. There is no mention of anti-German sentiment, nor are the deliberately new and different directions taken by composers identified as national or as in pursuit of a native, distinctly French voice. Note the terminology used to label "new currents" in French music: the "cosmopolitan tradition"; "the specifically French tradition"; "a later tradition, rooted in the French" (677).

The cosmopolitan tradition involves César Franck's technically "anti-Romantic" (anti-German?) work in the "traditional instrumental genres" (677). The second, the "specifically French tradition," is "essentially Classic," "transmitted through Camille Saint-Saëns" and his pupils, especially Gabriel Fauré.

There is another way that these traditions could have been labelled, however. Messing makes the following argument concerning "classicism," for example:

> Classicism tended to act as the embodiment of a number of aesthetic attributes which, even taken together, do not necessarily constitute for us an accurate basis for defining artistic style: clarity, simplicity, austerity, sobriety, pure construction, precision, discreet harmony, and formal perfection. Such words have validity to the extent that artists themselves found to be comprehensible and useful descriptions. The crucial point is that these terms could be represented as fundamentally nationalist traits, that is, Gallic, Hellenic, Latin, and southern. [35]

---

[35]Scott Messing, *Neoclassicism in Music*, 10.

The view, Messing continues, "that a wholesale reaction against German [Teutonic and northern] music in general, and Wagner in particular, would bring about a renascence of French music . . . had a large circulation in contemporary French histories of music as well."[36]

The situation regarding the co-existence of so-called "cosmopolitan" and "native" traditions is arguably analogous, at least at the rhetorical level, to that in Russia at this time: the Western-dominated St. Petersburg Conservatory parallels the French "cosmopolitan tradition"; the so-called *moguchay kuchka* or "The Mighty Handful," the "specifically French tradition." In the Russian case, however, "The Mighty Handful" is unequivocally and categorically nationalist, not just "Russian," whereas the *National Society for French Music*, similar in purpose to the Russian group, and "begun as elsewhere with nationalistic aims," gives rise to a "new" and "classic," not nationalistic, current in French music.

The significance of labelling this current as "new" becomes clear when traced to its culmination in the so-called "later tradition, rooted in the French" in the work of Debussy. Debussy is "one of the great seminal forces in the history of music," a force that influenced "nearly every distinguished composer of the early and middle twentieth century" (684). The text's reluctance to categorize French music with other national musics is plain. In light of Debussy's far-reaching and recognized "influence," his music-critical writings are not mentioned, and his well-

---

[36]Ibid., 10.

known musically nationalistic stance with regard to the hegemony of German music are only hinted at: impressionism, as one aspect of Debussy's style, "relied on allusion and understatement, the antithesis of the forthright, energetic, deep expressions of the Romantics" (680); "his anti-Romantic conception of music's function"; his "admiration for Wagner was coupled with revulsion against his bombastic rhetoric and his attempts to expound philosophy in music" (681). That Debussy is almost completely de-politicized, then, speaks to his secure, albeit somewhat peripheralized--insofar as he and his works do not figure among the general nineteenth-century genre discussions--canonic and "universally" influential status. As such, he cannot be limited to the local, that is, to the simply national and filed under the label of nationalism.

The treatment of Wagner, as might be expected, is of another kind. Wagner, as "the outstanding composer of German opera," is also "one of the crucial figures in the history of nineteenth-century music" (641). Focusing primarily on a description of the composer's works and his considerable influence on succeeding generations of composers, the text's references to Wagner's politics and literary output are, not surprisingly, brief and markedly understated. We do learn that "political unrest in Germany during 1848-49 persuaded Wagner to emigrate to Switzerland" (643); and that in addition to a series of theoretical essays about opera, the composer wrote on many things, "even political and moral issues" (641). Although the descriptive labels "German," "German Romantic opera," and

"Romantic opera in the tradition of Weber and Marschner" are used, the word nationalism is used here only once, and even then it is sanitized and elevated beyond the particular to the "universal": In the "sunny human comedy and mainly diatonic harmony of *Die Meistersinger* . . . Wagner succeeded most fully in fusing his ideas about music drama with the forms of Romantic opera and in combining a healthy nationalism with universal appeal" (648).

Grout-Palisca do not point out, however, that this so-called "healthy nationalism" is an absolutely intrinsic ingredient of the opera. The work's setting in the misty, fairy tale world of medieval Germany provided a Romantic, supposedly de-politicized escape from the industrial and commercial bustle of mid-nineteenth-century Germany.[37] This was a period of rapid economic expansion. A growing sense of national prestige reinforced the now unstoppable push for that country's unification. It was also, according to Barry Millington, a period characterized by attitudes of "chauvinism, insularity and xenophobia," wherein "the movement towards national unity began to be seen as less a struggle

---

[37]The aesthetic escape to medieval Germany was integral to the German nationalism espoused by Romantic writers. William Carr, *The Origins of the Wars of German Unification* (London and New York: Longman, 1991), writes: "Disoriented in a rapidly changing world, young writers such as Adam Müller, Friedrich von Hardenberg (known as Novalis) and Friedrich Schlegel turned to history for consolation . . . . The Romantics can really be credited with the rediscovery of the Middle Ages, dismissed as barbaric by eighteenth-century writers . . . . They conjured up a grotesquely unreal and thoroughly unhistorical picture of an unspoilt society where knights, merchants, clergy and peasants were inspired by a truly national spirit and when the Holy Roman Empire had been the focal point of a Christian German Europe. At a time when few Germans mourned the demise of that crumbling edifice, Romantic writers ensured that the corpse would live on in idealized form and become the prototype of the united Germany liberals were seeking to create in the nineteenth century" (20).

for democratic, constitutional government than as the necessity for asserting German values and culture over those of other races."[38] These attitudes are reflected in Sach's closing speech to the people, which, Millington states, is "an affirmation that even foreign domination cannot obliterate the German spirit so long as it resides in the art of the old masters and they are respected."[39] This is not to say that Wagner was responsible for German nationalism, but that, even more importantly, he "reflected it, focused it, and gave it such resonant expression that it sparked the imagination of future generations."[40]

Grout-Palisca's description of *Die Meistersinger* above characterizes the nature of rhetorical efforts being made here on this titanic figure's behalf: effusive, work-centred; and like Romantic art in the authors' conception, these efforts make no attempt, or at best, a minimal one to "mirror the concrete world" (564). There is no talk of Verdian struggles for musical independence, or Franco-nationalist efforts to recover and regain a great musical heritage. The discipline's discursive enclosure of this composer and his works is complete and well in place. Verdi and the French, although decidedly national or nationalistic, are allowed to approach the universal as a result of their undeniably prestigious and important music histories, their centuries-long alternating dominance of or meshing with the mainstream, and, in Debussy's case, an irrefutable influence on following

---

[38]Barry Millington, *Wagner* (The Master Musicians Series; London: J. M. Dent & Sons, Ltd., 1984/1992), 252.
[39]Ibid., 254.
[40]Ibid., 255.

generations of composers. Wagner, however, is part of a tradition that by its own definition is universal; even its nationalism is construed and represented as universal and apolitical. The aim of the text's distancing efforts is clear: the further from the particular--exemplified by the national and the nationalistic, in this case--the closer to the universal.

Grout-Palisca's reticence concerning Wagner and the notion of nationalism is one of the most extreme examples of textual "discordance" here, and representative of the text's attitude to the repertoire of German music as a whole. The authors' assertion that nationalism was not an issue in the music of Wagner is not the simple hiding of discordant elements in the margins of the text; it is an outright denial of historical evidence. Avoiding the matter of Wagner's nationalism is one thing; stating that nationalism was *not* an issue in Wagner's music is something else again. Wagner's own writings testify to his celebrated "Teutomania,"[41] an indulgence--as Michael Hughes, from another historical context points out--in *Deutschtümelei*, a manifestation of "'ultra-Germanness' or hypertrophe of the national ego" which involved a conviction that "German things were superior to everything else . . . that German achievement was the pinnacle of

---

[41]Michael Hughes, *Nationalism and Society*, 79. So-called "Teutomaniacs" comprised a lunatic fringe that went in for what came to be known as *Deutschtümelei*. Hughes cites Wagner's *German Art and German Politics* as an example of the composer's involvement in this kind of thinking, and states that "much of this crazy emphasis on Germanness was in itself a sign of inner feelings of national inadequacy and it disgusted and exasperated many Germans," such as the Young German writers who were "attached to the Mazzinian concept of national freedom as the basis for universal peace" (79-80).

human achievement."[42]

Notwithstanding Grout-Palisca's assumption of a fully protective and apolitical stance here, it is possible to tease out from the text's own narrative a number of threads which undermine and question its denial of this composer's musical nationalism. Significantly, these deconstructive threads can be traced through the discussion of Wagner, to the notion of Romanticism and the aesthetic-philosophical *and* political ground on which this notion rests.

Wagner's libretti, identified by Grout-Palisca as not "narrowly national," provide a useful point of entry here. The authors introduce the topic in their discussion of *Der Fliegende Holländer*: "The libretto--*written, like those of all his operas, by the composer himself*--is based on a legend" (641). Grout-Palisca do not identify this particular legend--which happens to be a conflation of Heinrich Heine's *Memoirs of Herr von Schnabelewopski* and William Hauff's fairy tale *Geschicte vom Gespensterschiff* (1825) with the Wagners' own sea journey of 1839[43]--nor do they acknowledge that Wagner's use and reworkings of these literary works could have nationalistic motives.[44] The story for the powerfully

---

[42]Ibid., 79.

[43]Peter Wapnewski, translated by Peter Palmer, "The Operas as Literary Works" in Ulrich Müller and Peter Wapnewski, eds., *Wagner Handbook*, translation edited by John Deathridge (Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press, 1992, 3-95), 14-15.

[44]See Hinrich C. Seeba, "'Germany--A Literary Concept': The Myth of National Literature," *German Studies Review* 17/2 (May 1994): 353-369, for a discussion of the project of national literature--*Nationalliteratur*--in nineteenth-century Germany: "Whoever wanted to localize Germany, which had all but disappeared from the political map of the nineteeth century, had to reinvent it as a Germany of the mind, as a literary and intellectual concept to be taught in the institutions of higher learning" (357).

influential *Tristan und Isolde* is also based on an ethnically German source, a "thirteenth-century medieval romance by Gottfried von Strassburg" (645). It is well-known that in addition to a fascination with and thorough knowledge of medieval Celtic and Norse-Germanic mythology, Jakob Grimm's *Deutsche Mythologie* to be specific, Wagner was equally attracted to that of the ancient Greeks. However, stories from each of these literatures were chosen and thoroughly reformulated, Norse gods were freely replaced with their German equivalents, and so on: all in the service of an intensely *personal*, and, by definition, ethnically German music-dramatic aesthetic. There is no lack of anecdotal evidence for this. Reaching beyond this text to a letter dated 16 April 1856, for example, the Swiss writer Gottfried Keller wrote to Hermann Hettner recommending Wagner's privately printed *Nibelungen* work--a work undeniably influenced by the *Oresteia*: "You will find a powerful, typically Germanic poetry here, but one which is ennobled by a sense of antique tragedy."[45] Is it the use of "exotic," non-native, that is, Greek influences that allow *Der Ring des Nibelungen* to transcend its identifiably ethno-national literary context, despite the indisputable celebration of the *Nibelunglied* as a "national monument of the German spirit" by nineteenth-century nationalists?[46] And is it not curious that this

---

[45]Raymond Furness, *Wagner and Literature* (Manchester: Manchester University Press and New York: St. Martin's Press, Inc., 1982), 73.

[46]Hinrich C. Seeba, "'Germany--A Literary Concept,'": "Seen as the heroic origin of what was to be canonized as the German national literature, the *Nibelunglied* set the stage for both philological and mythological concerns to serve the nationalist need for an imagined tradition which would give enough strength to resist Napoleon" (360).

same criterion is not applied to the classification of a contemporary work, Dargomïzhsky's conventionally nationalistic opera *par excellence*, *The Stone Guest* (1867-69), a setting of Alexander Pushkin's version of the Don Juan story, "Little Tragedy"? (Mozart's version of this story is, of course, the opera *Don Giovanni*.) The Grout-Palisca text itself, however, provides only this minimal information: "the four dramas [of *Der Ring des Nibelungen*], woven out of stories from Norse legends, are linked by a common set of characters and musical motives" (644).

On the basis of these few examples concerning subject matter *alone*, how is it possible to deny the overwhelmingly Germanic *and* nationalistic literary content of Wagner's works? Inasmuch as Wagner's work is "Wagnerian," it is ethnically German or national. And if we are to accept the four elements outlined by Grout-Palisca in the introduction of "Nationalism"--emphasis on literary and linguistic traditions, an interest in folklore, a large dose of patriotism, and a craving for independence and identity--as indicative of nationalism in music, then nationalism really *was* an issue in Wagner's music, as it was in German and all other musics at this time in history. The problem is that for Grout-Palisca and the music-historiographic tradition which they represent, nationalism in music is really about the music of others; it is not about German music.

Earlier in this paper, I wrote that, although historically untenable, German music is the only repertoire left "untainted" by nationalism at the end of Grout-

Palisca's five-chapter discussion of nineteenth-century music. At this point, and in light of the foregoing analysis of some of the text's "discordances," it is clear that the text's own narrative works to subvert the historiographic protection of any repertoire, German included. I also pointed out that the only label, if any, consistently associated with German music was "Romantic."[47]

This is a rhetorical maneuver, however, and one that is patently duplicitous: not only is the term "Romantic" a euphemism for German musical nationalism--what Grout, Fourth Edition (664), terms "musical Romanticism"--it is a term which *by definition, embodies the justification of its very own assumption of an apolitical and non-particularistic autonomy.*

Consider briefly Grout-Palisca's description of Weber's *Der Freischütz* (1821), an opera in every way as nationalistic as anything by Verdi, Musorgsky, Janáček, or Moniuszko. Weber's opera, the authors claim, "exemplifies the characteristics of German Romantic opera" in its choice of fairy tale plot, which involves "supernatural beings and happenings against a background of wild and mysterious

---

[47]Compared with that in the Fourth Edition, the discussion of "Romanticism" in the Fifth Edition, in terms of pages allotted and subject matter covered, is markedly abbreviated. The Fourth Edition, for example, devotes five and one-half pages to the familiar "Romantic Dualities" alone, one of which is "Nationalism and Internationalism." This "duality" is introduced in the following way: "Nationalism was an important influence in Romantic music"; and continues, "Musical Romanticism flourished especially in Germany, not only because the Romantic temper was congenial to German ways of thinking, but also because in that country national sentiment, being for a long time suppressed politically, had to find outlets in music and other forms of art" (664). Significantly, this is conceived here as a universal "musical Romanticism": "The music of the great Romantic composers was not, of course, limited to one country; it was addressed to all humanity." And so, once again, it is a nationalism which, in its Romantically-defined greatness, is necessarily universal.

nature," and other such conventionally Romantic features (639). However, this opera can also be shown to exemplify (the authors' own definition of) nationalism in music, including, and especially so, the "one important aspect of nationalism": "the search for an independent, native voice" (666). It is important to remember, as Sanna Pederson points out, that opera was "a genre in which Germany had fallen lamentably behind."[48] Grout-Palisca, on the other hand, say only that "without the long-established operatic tradition that Italian opera enjoyed, German opera was more open to experimentation" (638); and describe in great detail how this opera, which *established* German Romantic opera, "differs sharply from contemporary French and Italian opera" (639). Add to this the "use of folklike melodies" which introduce "a distinctly German national element" (639), we have what, in the discussion of any other nation's operatic works, would be called "national," or, given the thrust of music-aesthetic polemics contemporary to this opera, "nationalistic" opera.

Weber's opera, like these polemics, were part of a larger issue which emerged in Germany after the Wars of Liberation in 1809 and 1813, an issue that was concerned with the specific relationship between a nation's artistic achievements and its identity. Sanna Pederson describes the crucial and, as it turns out, decidedly strategic role assigned to music in this identity-seeking enterprise:

---

[48]Sanna Pederson, "On the task of the Music Historian: The Myth of the Symphony after Beethoven," in *repercussions* 2/2 (Fall 1993: 5-30), 17.

> Music emerged as part of the German's purely spiritual sphere and as integral to the German's identity at about this time. Music was claimed as the special property of the Germans; but, since it could hardly be maintained that the most prestigious and profitable genre, opera, was anything other than overwhelmingly Italian, this claim was narrowed to instrumental music . . . as a part of the early Romantic movement, the aesthetics of autonomous art exalted instrumental music as cut off from external reality, as a world unto itself.[49]

Credited with establishing Beethoven and his symphonies "as a touchstone of German identity,"[50] E. T. A. Hoffmann and A. B. Marx--the latter in particular--were two of the writers and critics who took upon themselves this task of "exalting" German instrumental music to the status of an autonomous art, an "absolute music." This was a music that was construed as having no function--such as identity-seeking nationalism-in-music, for example--and a music that, moreover, was specifically and only German: a music that excluded "frivolous, unsubstantial, and unworthy" "foreign" music.[51] In doing so, these writers can also be credited with establishing the ideological ground for the practice of Western music historiography as we know it today. The notion of absolute music and the discourse of music historiography--in the role of this notion's "publicist"--are, in their conception as rhetorical strategies, similar in nature and function. Each is

---

[49]Ibid., 13-14. See also Pederson, "A. B. Marx, Berlin Concert Life, and German National Identity," in *19th-Century Music* 18/2 (Fall 1994):87-107; Celia Applegate, "What is German Music? Reflections on the Role of Art in the Creation of the Nation," in *German Studies Review, Special Issue: German Identity* (Winter 1992): 21-32; Pamela M. Potter, "Musicology Under Hitler: New Sources in Context," in *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 49/1 (Spring 1996): 70-113; David B. Dennis, *The Indoctrination of a Muse: Myths of Ludwig van Beethoven and His Music as Evoked in German Political Culture from 1789 to 1989* (Ph.D. Dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, 1991).

[50]Sanna Pederson, 14.

[51]Sanna Pederson, "A. B. Marx, Berlin Concert Life, and German Identity," 89.

boundary-producing, and each is engaged in the construction of a specifically German cultural *and* ethno-national identity: narrative activities which are filtered through and depoliticized by the ostensibly otherworldly screen of Romanticism.

As both a product and determinant of historiographic practice, then, "Romantic," like nationalism, is more than a label. It is a discourse--a meta-discourse, in this instance--whose lofty, aesthetic-philosophical rhetoric is charged with the construction of an autonomous and universal musical art; more specifically, a German musical art that transcends the mundane and the particular. Such a discourse is necessarily, and in this case, intensely political; it is, in effect, a politics of anti-politics.

On page 564 of the text, Grout-Palisca write:

> If remoteness and boundlessness are Romantic, then music is the most Romantic of the arts. Its world of ordered sound and rhythm does not mirror the concrete world, and this independence enables music to evoke the flood of impressions, thoughts, and feelings that is the proper domain of art (564).

If this is so, the language of Grout-Palisca's music historiography is in itself Romantic, aiming as it does for "remoteness" and "independence" from the "concrete world." The success of its distancing and/or abstracting procedures is highly questionable; but, as the analysis of some of its rhetorical machinations shows, it *is* successful in revealing why the notion of "late nineteenth-century music as so many satellite 'nationalisms' revolving round a large German Romantic planet [has been influential] in helping to establish the primacy of the

German tradition in Western music as a powerful historiographic norm."[52]

[52]John Deathridge, "Germany: the 'Special Path,'" in Jim Samson, ed., *The Late Romantic Era: From the mid-19th Century to World War I* (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1991), 63. Further to this, Deathridge writes: "It is hard to see, however, why music should have been so remote from reality at just that moment in history when leading musicians and writers on music--especially those in Germany--were more articulate about and critical of the world around them than they had probably ever been before" (64).

IV Conclusions

In the Preface to this "rewritten" Fifth Edition of *A History of Western Music*, Palisca promised a "readable" but, more importantly, an "honest" account: "I have aimed to facilitate reading and comprehension, sacrificing personal styles and enthusiasms for clear, straightforward writing. Though obviously Professor Grout and I wrote about music that we esteem highly, every student and listener must arrive at a personal judgement, free from the bias of others" (xii). It is a promise somewhat reminiscent of Leopold von Ranke's famous dictum: to show only what actually happened--*wie es eigentlich gewesen;* and a promise which claims to eschew all stylistic and rhetorical authorial interference, a claim in itself rhetorical. Although the following statement concerns another historian, it can be applied with equal validity here: "The very fact that [Palisca] has to go to so much trouble to contrive a 'zero degree' of narration, and the dubious success of his achievement, both go to show *a contrario* the stylistic loading of the historical text."[1]

With all due respect to Professor Palisca, then, the efforts to rewrite this text--"most drastically in the chapters from the eighteenth century on"--are largely superficial in nature. Palisca's definition of nationalism in nineteenth-century

---

[1]Stephen Bann, *The Clothing of Clio: A Study of the Representation of History in Nineteenth-Century Britain and France* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984), 5. Bann's reference here is to Ranke's contemporary, the French historian Prosper de Barante--both of whom aspired to a "scientific" and neutral historiography. Bann points out, however, that "transparency to the 'facts' is the historian's code of literary practice, even though he is using figures of speech and narrative structures like any other literary craftsman" (5).

music remains, as in previous editions, contradictory, discriminatory, and at this late date, perhaps even dis-informative. In the service of current sensibilities, Palisca has removed some of Grout's more overtly prejudiced, combative and/or objectionable terminology;[2] the outcome, however, is, as I have suggested above, not only somewhat anemic, it is historically simplistic, reductive, even evasive.

This is so for a number of reasons. In the first place, it is not possible to remove "bias" from historical narrative insofar as "unbiased" implies some sort of abstract objectivity or metatextual "Truth." Historiography, as pointed out above, is a literary art. It is, therefore, a genre that uses language to grasp the world, to position itself, and in the process, construct an identity. In subjects like history, writes Michael Stanford,

> our thinking is held within the linguistic frame with which we apprehend reality . . . . As soon as historians confront their evidence, and before they apply it to their conceptual (and presumably technical) apparatus, they must 'prefigure' the field. This is essentially a poetic act.[3]

Grout's bias, then, is necessarily replaced with or rewritten in terms of Palisca's

---

[2]For example, Grout with Claude V. Palisca, Third Edition (1980), writes that "nationalism was one of the *weapons* by which composers in those countries [those that had "no *great* or unbroken musical tradition of their own"] sought to free themselves from the domination of foreign music. As a movement, it was self-conscious, and sometimes *aggressive*" (653). Another example concerns the changing descriptions of Musorgsky. The Fifth Edition introduces Musorgsky in the following manner: "The greatest of the Mighty Handful, Modest Musorgsky earned a living as a clerk in the civil service and received most of his musical training from Balakirev" (668). The Fourth Edition says the same thing except that Musorgsky earned "a *painful* living" (774). The Third Edition, on the other hand, states that "Mussorgsky [sic], the greatest of the "mighty handful," was also one of the least well-equipped with the techniques of composition. A militant nationalist, he earned a painful living as a clerk in the civil service, and received most of his musical training from Balakirev" (654-655). The Fourth and Fifth Editions do comment on Musorgsky's compositional skills and/or lack thereof, but later in the account and with more "tact."

[3]Michael Stanford, *The Nature of Historical Knowledge* (Oxford and Cambridge: Blackwell, 1986), 133.

own personal bias--a "prefiguring" which determines not only *what* is to be dealt with, but *how* it is to be handled, in other words, the concepts to be used.

Secondly, and in general, the "rewriting" promised and undertaken here is not "drastic" in any substantive, epistemological or philosophical way. Any changes to the five-chapter treatment of mainstream nineteenth-century musics are cosmetic: the dominant status of German music is unchanged. On the other hand, the concept of nationalism-in-music and its exponents are marginalized--through processes of omission and repression--to an even greater extent. In short, the tenure of the mainstream/nationalist dichotomy has been neither interrupted nor threatened. For example, the "Nationalism" section's familiar introductory sentence, that "nationalism was an important force in nineteenth-century music," is omitted in the fifth-edition text. Reworded to situate musical nationalism in qualities typically associated with Romantic nationalism, these qualities are then applied only to non-Germanic or "foreign" composers. Furthermore, nationalism's widely-recognized affiliation with, and in fact, *origin*[4] in Romanticism is reduced to a vestige of its former self (see the discussion of "Romantic Dualities" in the first four editions of the Grout and Grout-Palisca texts), and an ironic one at that. It consists of a sentence which, in the attempt to situate Verdi and Italian music

---

[4]It seems that only in Grout-Palisca--i.e., in traditional Western art music histories--is this connection not made explicit. Elsewhere, the thinking is overwhelmingly in line with the following: "Nationalism is a phenomenon of the European nineteenth century. It is a political consequence of the literary-intellectual movement called Romanticism, a Central European reaction to the universalizing, and therefore disorienting, ideas of the eighteenth-century French Enlightenment"--from William Pfaff, *The Wrath of Nations: Civilization and the Furies of Nationalism* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1993), 14.

firmly in the nationalist camp, works simultaneously to subvert the "Romanticism" of Wagner and other German and/or "Romantic" composers--tarring them, so to speak, with the same brush: "the only Romantic issue that much affected Italian music was nationalism . . . " (633).

My purpose here is not to criticize this text's lack of comprehensive and/or explicatory historical detail, tasks clearly beyond the pedagogical requirements of a music history survey textbook. Nor is it to criticize Palisca's decision to confine the domain of this music history to the tradition of Western art music. The criticism here is directed at the author's choice of music-historiographic tradition: a choice--in light of the self-examination current in the disciplines of literary theory and philosophy, as well as more recently in those of history, historiography, and historical musicology itself--best described as blinkered. As I see it, the authors of music history texts have, at the very least, a twofold responsibility: to restore to music its worldly and contextual "graininess"; and to practice--as promised in this preface--"honest" and "straightforward" scholarship by identifying, at the outset, the historiographic "prefiguring" or bias that informs their work. In short, this is a call to right the writing of Western art music history.

It is time, therefore, to (1) rethink the claim that "nationalism was not really an issue in the music of any . . . composers [in the Austro-German orbit]," or, more to the point, in the *writing of the history of that music;* and (2) acknowledge

the premise of German musical dominance as one in a series, or a "nesting,"[5] of nationalisms. That Palisca chooses not to do so belies the text's 1996 publication date, and situates it solidly within an historiographic tradition that is grounded aesthetically, philosophically and epistemologically in the ethnocentric and nationalistic institution of nineteenth-century German musicology.[6]

Insofar as musicology is a discipline that was born during the campaigns for national unification and the active promotion of the idea of a German nation--an idea that persisted to the end of World War II--Potter points out that "it is logical that German nationalism should have had a strong tradition in German musicology."[7] However, this is an historiographic orientation that is no longer relevant: it is from another time and another place. Even so,

> certain elements of Germanocentrism were so firmly established in musicology that they not only survived the "denazification" of the discipline but also migrated to the United States with the victims of National Socialism, becoming an essential part of our own intellectual history . . . Émigré musicologists like Einstein, Geiringer, and Schrade . . . could continue to contribute to a Germanocentric concept of music history that still persists in such basic venues as textbooks, particularly in their coverage of the last two centuries.[8]

Speaking directly to this issue with the Grout text in mind, Roger Rideout argues

---

[5] Germany's musical nationalism was in response to French political and cultural hegemony; that of Russia and Eastern-Europe to French and German cultural imperialism, and so on--all overlapping struggles to establish a "self" against an "other."

[6]See Roger Rideout, "The German Model in Music Curricula," *College Music Symposium* 30/2 (Fall 1990): 106-111; Pamela M. Potter, *Trends in German Musicology, 1918-1945: The Effects of Methodological, Ideological, and Institutional Change on the Writing of Music History* (Ph.D. Dissertation, Yale University, 1991).

[7]Pamela Potter, "Musicology under Hitler," 108.

[8]Ibid.,107-8.

that Donald Grout, unlike expatriate German musicologists such as Bukofzer, Einstein, and Reese, for example, was not obligated, either by training or national concerns, to respond to the pressures of traditional German and Germanocentric pedagogical models. Neither, I must assume, was Palisca. Nevertheless,

> Grout's text [as does Palisca's rewritten version] bears their stamp . . . while his text became the best summary of music's journey into this century, it did not overcome the limitations of the German nationalistic perspective, but rather institutionalized it for two generations of students.[9]

There is no question that Palisca's fifth-edition text has been rewritten within the disciplinary guidelines of this institutionalized perspective. Its music-historiographical discourse continues to work to enclose or "frame" music--especially "German" music--according to the tenets laid down by yet another frame, the aesthetics of German "Romanticism."[10] Moreover, the interpenetration of these two frames by that of a variety of nationalisms ensures that the musical "mainstream" is, indeed, multiply framed. As the foregoing

---

[9]Roger Rideout, "The German Model in Music Curricula," 108. See also Pamela Potter, "Conclusions" to "Musicology under Hitler," 105-110.

[10]Henry J. Schmidt, "What is Oppositional Criticism? Politics and German Literary Criticism from Fascism to the Cold War," *Poetics Today* 9/4 (1988): 749-766, discusses, among other things, the move of German literary critics from *Geistesgeschichte*, "which had been tainted by Nazism, to text-immanent criticism, a European variant of New Criticism closely linked to phenomenology and Christian Existentialism" (755)--in my view, a criticism which perpetuated Romanticism's protective and ethnocentric notion of absolute music, and before that, of Baumgarten's and Kant's disinterested objectification and reception of the necessarily autonomous art object. This text-immanent method was taken up after World War II in the American discipline of *Germanistik*, claiming "to accommodate what proponents called the 'no-nonsense pragmatism' of the American student (759)." Like "absolute" music, text-immanent criticism was intended to de-contextualize and, in particular, to de-politicize the canonized classics of German literature. Schmidt argues that "discourse based on the vocabulary of 'timeless values' is in fact provincial rather than universal--and intentionally or not--ultimately imperialistic (763)."

analysis has shown, however, these frames have not been "sure"; they have not succeeded in protecting either music and/or music making, or, for that matter, their own framing activities from a deconstructive reading.

By virtue of its very nature as a *linguistic* construction, a discursive formation such as music historiography is permeable and open to other "texts": it is necessarily intertextual. Music-historiography as frame--as the "distinction between inside and outside"--overlaps with both its "creation," the absolute art object, and with those of its informing ideologies in the general or "worldly" text--the Romantic aesthetic and nineteenth-century nationalisms. In doing so, historiography's framing processes here approach Derrida's logic of the frame or *parergon,* because "at the very moment that the frame is playing an essential, constitutive, enshrining and protecting role . . . it undermines this role by leading itself to be defined as subsidiary ornamentation."[11] In other words, music-historiography-as-frame assumes a wholly untenable disinterested transparency. Derrida describes the work of the frame/*parergon* in this way:

> The *parergon* stands out [*se détache*] both from the *ergon* [the work] and from the milieu, it stands out first of all like a figure on a ground. But it does not stand out in the same way as the work. The latter also stands out against a ground. But the parergonal frame stands out against two grounds [*fonds*], but with respect to each of those two grounds, it merges [*se fond*] into the other. With respect to the work which can serve as a ground for it, it merges into the wall, and then, gradually, into the general text. With respect to the background which the general text is, it merges into the work which stands out against the general background. There is always a form on the ground,

---

[11]Jonathan Culler, *On Deconstruction: Theory and Criticism after Structuralism* (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1982), 195.

> but the *parergon* is a form which has as its traditional determination not that it stands out but that it disappears, buries itself, effaces itself, melts away at the moment it deploys its greatest energy.[12]

Since the study of Western art music history is as much a study of music historiography and, by implication, music historians, historiography cannot be conceived of as extra to the study of music history, or for that matter, to the process of nation-building. It is, indeed, constitutive of that music, its history, and in this case, of German nation-ness. The failure to acknowledge this, and to ignore the reality that musicology is in itself a socio-political act can be regarded, in Philip Bohlman's words, "as a supreme form of the irresponsibility of scholarship, the dire consequences of which in the late twentieth century are no longer avoidable."[13]

* * *

I grew up with music whose history cannot be written within the discursive frame of Grout-Palisca's music historiography. I am not speaking here of one particular music; I am speaking of all musics that could be excluded from a music historiography grounded in the nineteenth-century aesthetic of absolute music, an

---

[12]Jacques Derrida, *The Truth in Painting*, translated by Geoff Bennington and Ian McLeod (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1987), 61. Derrida's essay "Parergon" takes up the question of the supposed autonomy of art and its relation to the various discourses--criticism, aesthetics, art history--which seek to preserve that autonomy.

[13]Philip V. Bohlman, "Musicology as a Political Act," *The Journal of Musicology* 11/4 (Fall 1993: 411-436), 436.

aesthetic intended to carve out a specific music-historical identity. Inasmuch as such an historiography is permitted to tell only part of the story, it is equally exclusive, I suggest, of the music whose history it was engaged to tell.

Let us not seek to solidify, to turn the otherness of the foreigner into a thing. Let us merely touch it, brush by it, without giving it a permanent structure. Simply sketching out its perpetual motion through its variegated aspects spread out before our eyes today, through some of its former, changing representations scattered throughout history. Let us also lighten that otherness by constantly coming back to it--but more and more swiftly. Let us escape its hatred, its burden, fleeing them not through levelling and forgetting, but through the harmonious *repetition of the differences it implies and spreads.* Toccatas and Fugues*: Bach's compositions evoke to my ears the meaning of an acknowledged and harrowing otherness that I should like to be contemporary, because it has been brought up, relieved, disseminated, without goal, without boundary, without end. An otherness barely touched upon and that already moves away.*

Julia Kristeva,
Strangers to Ourselves, 1991.
Translated by Leon S. Roudiez.

V Bibliography

Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso, 1983.

Applegate, Celia. "What is German Music? Reflections on the Role of Art in the Creation of a Nation." *German Studies Review, Special Issue: German Identity* (Winter 1992): 21-32.

Ball, William Scott. *Reclaiming a Music for England: Nationalist Concept and Controversy in English Musical Thought and Criticism, 1880-1920*. Ph.D. Dissertation, The Ohio State University, 1993.

Bann, Stephen. *The Clothing of Clio: A Study of the Representation of History in Nineteenth-Century Britain and France*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984.

Barnes, Harry Elmer. *A History of Historical Writing*. Second Revised Edition. New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1963.

Barzman, Karen-Edis. "Beyond the Canon: Feminists, Postmodernism, and the History of Art." *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 52/3 (Summer 1994): 327-339.

Beckerman, Michael. "The Master's Little Joke: Antonin Dvořák and the Mask of Nation." In Michael Beckerman, ed., *Dvořák and His World*, 134-154. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1993.

Bergeron, Katherine and Philip V. Bohlman, eds. *Disciplining Music: Musicology and its Canons*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1992.

Bernstein, Richard J. *The New Constellation: The Ethical-Political Horizons of Modernity/Postmodernity*. Cambridge, Masschusetts: The MIT Press, 1992.

Beveridge, David. "Dvořák's 'Dumka' and the Concept of Nationalism in Music Historiography." *The Journal of Musicological Research* 12 (1993): 303-325.

_____. "Dvořák and Brahms: A Chronicle, an Interpretation." In Michael Beckerman, ed., *Dvořák and His World*, 56-91. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1993.

Bhaba, Homi K. "Introduction: Narrating the Nation." In Homi K. Bhaba, ed., *Nation and Narration*, 1-7. London and New York: Routledge, 1990.

Bohlman, Philip V. "Musicology as a Political Act." *The Journal of Musicology* 11/2 (Fall 1993): 411-436.

Breisach, Ernst. *Historiography: Ancient, Medieval, and Modern*. Second Edition. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1994.

Brennan, Timothy. "The National Longing for Form." In Homi K. Bhaba, ed., *Nation and Narration*, 44-70. London and New York: Routledge, 1990.

Brook, Barry S., Edward O. D. Downes, and Sherman Van Solkema, eds. *Perspectives in Musicology*: The Inaugural Lectures of the Ph.D. Program in Music at the City University of New York. New York: W. W. Norton and Company, Inc., 1972.

Burney, Charles. *A General History of Music: From the Earliest Ages to the Present Period (1789)*. Volume the First with Critical and Historical Notes by Frank Mercer. New York: Dover Publications, 1957.

Carr, E. H., Group Chairman. *Nationalism: A Report by a Study Group of Members of the Royal Institute of International Affairs*. London: Frank Cass and Co. Ltd., 1939/1963.

Carr, William. *The Origins of the Wars of German Unification*. London and New York: Longman, 1991.

Chatterjee, Partha. *Nationalist Thought and the Colonial World*. United Nations University, Tokyo: Zed Books Ltd., 1986.

Clifford, James. *The Predicament of Culture: Twentieth-Century Ethnography, Literature, and Art*. Cambridge, Massachusetts and London, England: Harvard University Press, 1988.

Connor, Walker. *Ethnonationalism: The Quest for Understanding*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1994.

Cranston, Maurice. *The Romantic Movement*. Oxford and Cambridge: Blackwell, 1994.

Culler, Jonathan. *On Deconstruction: Theory and Criticism after Structuralism*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1982.

Dahlhaus, Carl. *Nineteenth-Century Music*. English translation by J. Bradford Robinson. Berkeley, Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1989.

_____. *The Idea of Absolute Music*. Translated by Roger Lustig. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1989.

_____. *Between Romanticism and Modernism: Four Studies in the Music of the Later Nineteenth Century*. Translated by Mary Whittall. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press, 1980.

Deathridge, John. "Germany: the 'Special Path.'" In Jim Samson, *The Late Romantic Era: From the mid-19th Century to World War I*, 50-73. Music and Society Series. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall Inc., 1991.

Dennis, David Bruce. *The Indoctrination of a Muse: Myths of Ludwig van Beethoven and His Music as Evoked in German Political Culture from 1789 to 1989*. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, 1991.

Derrida, Jacques. *The Truth in Painting*. Translated by Geoff Bennington and Ian McLeod. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1987.

Diamond, Beverley and Robert Witmer. *Canadian Music: Issues of Hegemony and Identity*. Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press, 1994.

Dupree, Mary. "Beyond Music in Western Civilization: Issues in Undergraduate Music History Literacy." *College Music Symposium* 30/2 (Fall 1990): 100-105.

Einstein, Alfred. *Music in the Romantic Era: A History of Musical Thought in the 19th Century*. New York and London: W. W. Norton and Company, 1947/1975.

Foucault, Michel. *The Archaeology of Knowledge and The Discourse on Language*. Translated from the French by A. M. Sheridan Smith. New York: Pantheon Books, 1972.

Furness, Raymond. *Wagner and Literature*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1982.

Goldman, Albert and Evert Sprinchorn. "Introduction." In Richard Wagner, *On Music and Drama*. Translated by H. Ashton Ellis. Edited by Albert Goldman and Evert Sprinchorn. Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press, 1964/1992.

Gossman, Lionel. "History as Decipherment: Romantic Historiography and the Discovery of the Other." *New Literary History* 18/1 (Autumn 1986): 23-57.

Grout, Donald Jay and Claude V. Palisca. *A History of Western Music*. Fifth Edition. New York and London: W. W. Norton and Company, 1996.

_____. *A History of Western Music*. Fourth Edition. New York and London: W. W. Norton and Company, 1988.

Grout, Donald Jay. *A History of Western Music*. Third Edition with Claude V. Palisca. New York and London: W. W. Norton and Company, Inc., 1980.

_____. *A History of Western Music*. Revised Edition. New York: W. W. Norton and Company, Inc., 1973.

_____. *A History of Western Music*. Shorter Edition. New York: W. W. Norton and Company, Inc., 1964.

Guibernau, Montserrat. *Nationalisms: The Nation-State and Nationalism in the Twentieth Century*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, 1996.

Hepokoski, James. "The Dahlhaus Project and Its Extra-musicological Sources." *19th-Century Music* 14/3 (Spring 1991): 221-246.

Hobsbawm, Eric J. "Ethnicity and Nationalism in Europe Today." In Gopal Balakrishnan, ed., *Mapping the Nation*, 255-266. Introduced by Benedict Anderson. London and New York: Verso, 1996.

Hughes, Michael. *Nationalism and Society: Germany 1800-1945*. London: Edward Arnold, 1988.

Hutcheon, Linda. "Introduction." In Linda Hutcheon and Marion Richmond, eds., *Other Solitudes: Canadian Multicultural Fictions*. Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1990.

Hutchinson, John and Anthony D. Smith, eds. *Nationalism*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1994.

Iggers, Georg G. *The German Conception of History: The National Tradition of Historical Thought from Herder to the Present.* Revised Edition. Middletown, Connecticut: Wesleyan University Press, 1968/1983.

James, Harold. "Reflections on German Identity: Introduction." *German Studies Review, Special Issue: German Identity* (Winter 1992): 1-5.

Jenkins, Keith. *Re-thinking History*. London and New York: Routledge, 1991.

Johnson, Barbara. *A World of Difference*. Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1987.

Kemiläinen, Aira. *Nationalism: Problems Concerning the Word, the Concept and Classification*. Jyväskylä: Kustantajat Publishers, 1964.

Kingsbury, Henry. "Sociological Factors in Musicological Poetics." *Ethnomusicology* 35/2 (Spring/Summer 1991): 195-219.

Lamont, Michèle and Marcel Fournier, eds. *Cultivating Differences: Symbolic Boundaries and the Making of Inequality*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1992.

Lehman, Hartmut. "The Germans as a Chosen People: Old Testament Themes in German Nationalism." *German Studies Review* 14/2 (May 1991): 261-273.

Lentricchia, Frank and Thomas McLaughlin, eds. *Critical Terms for Literary Study*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1990.

Liberkowski, Ida Donata. *Ethnicity and Italian Opera: A Processual Analysis of Ethnic Expression in the Performing Arts*. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Pennsylavania, 1983.

Longyear, Rey M. *Nineteenth-Century Romanticism in Music*. Prentice Hall History of Music Series. Third Edition. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1988.

Lorraine, Renée. "Musicology and Theory: Where It's Been, Where It's Going." *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 51/2 (Spring 1993): 235-244.

Lowe, Donald M. Review of Tzvetan Todorov, *The Conquest of America: The Question of the Other*. Translated by Richard Howard. New York: Harper Colophon, 1984. In *American Historical Review* 91 (April 1986): 494.

Manzo, Kathryn A. *Creating Boundaries: The Politics of Race and Nation*. Boulder and London: Lynne Rienner Publishers, Inc., 1996.

Mayall, James. *Nationalism and International Society*. Cambridge Studies in International Relations: 10. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

McClary, Susan. "Narrative Agendas in 'Absolute' Music: Identity and Difference in Brahms's Third Symphony." In Ruth A. Solie, ed., *Musicology and Difference: Gender and Sexuality in Music Scholarship,* 326-344. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press, 1993.

Messing, Scott. *Neoclassicism in Music: From the Genesis of the Concept through the Schoenberg/Stravinsky Polemic*. Studies in Musicology, No. 101. Ann Arbor and London: UMI Research Press, 1988.

Millington, Barry. *Wagner*. The Master Musicians Series, Stanley Sadie, ed. London: J. M. Dent and Sons Ltd., 1984/1992.

Minnich, Elizabeth Kamarck. *Transforming Knowledge*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1990.

Minow, Martha. *Making All the Difference: Inclusion, Exclusion, and American Law*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1990.

Mosse, George L. *The Crisis of German Ideology: Intellectual Origins of the Third Reich*. New York: Grosset and Dunlap, 1964.

Norris, Christopher. "Deconstruction, Post-Modernism and the Visual Arts." In Christopher Norris and Andrew Benjamin, *What is Deconstruction?,* 7-32. London: Academy Editions, 1988.

Notley, Margaret. "Brahms as Liberal: Genre, Style, and Politics in Late Nineteenth-Century Vienna." *19th-Century Music* 17/2 (Fall 1993): 107-123.

Papers of the Colloque at Saint-Germain-En-Laye, September 1970. *Studies on 19th-Century Music* V: "Patterns in the Historiography of 19th-Century Music." *Acta Musicologica* 43, Fasc. 3-4 (1971): 248-283.

Pederson, Sanna. "A. B. Marx, Berlin Concert Life, and German National Identity." *19th-Century Music* 18/2 (Fall 1994): 87-107.

_____. "On the Task of the Music Historian: The Myth of the Symphony after Beethoven." *repercussions* 2/2 (Fall 1993): 5-30.

Pfaff, William. *The Wrath of Nations: Civilization and the Furies of Nationalism*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1993.

Potter, Pamela. "Musicology Under Hitler: New Sources in Context." *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 49/1 (Spring 1996): 70-113.

_____. *Trends in German Musicology, 1918-1945: The Effects of Methodological, Ideological, and Institutional Change on the Writing of Music History*. Ph.D. Dissertation, Yale University, 1991.

Prawer, Siegbert, ed. *The Romantic Period in Germany*. Essays by Members of the London University Institute of Germanic Studies. New York: Schoken Books, 1970.

Preiswerk, Roy and Dominique Perrot. *Ethnocentrism and History: Africa, Asia and Indian America in Western Textbooks*. New York, London, Lagos: Nok Publishers International, 1978.

Ridenour, Robert C. *Nationalism, Modernism, and Personal Rivalry in Nineteenth-Century Russian Music*. Ann Arbor, Michigan: UMI Research Press, 1981/1977.

Rideout, Roger. "The German Model in Music Curricula." *College Music Symposium* 30/2 (Fall, 1990): 106-111.

Said, Edward W. *Culture and Imperialism*. New York: Vintage Books, 1994.

Schmidt, Henry. "What is Oppositional Criticism? Politics and German Literary Criticism from Fascism to the Cold War." *Poetics Today* 9/4 (1988): 749-766.

Schumann, Robert. *On Music and Musicians*. Edited by Konrad Wolff. Translated by Paul Rosenfeld. New York, Toronto, London: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1964.

Seeba, Hinrich C. "'Germany--A Literary Concept'": The Myth of National Literature." *German Studies Review* 17/2 (May 1994): 353-369.

Shepherd, John. "Difference and Power in Music." In Ruth A. Solie, ed., *Musicology and Difference: Gender and Sexuality in Music Scholarship*, 46-65. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press, 1993.

Smith, Anthony D. "Nationalism and the Historians." In Anthony D. Smith, ed., *Ethnicity and Nationalism*. International Studies in Sociology and Social Anthropology, Volume 60. Leiden, New York, Köln: E. J. Brill, 1992.

_____. *Theories of Nationalism*. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1971.

Solie, Ruth A. "Introduction: On 'Difference.'" In Ruth A. Solie, ed., *Musicology and Difference: Gender and Sexuality in Music Scholarship*, 1-20. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press, 1993.

Spielvogel, Jackson J. *Western Civilization: Since 1300*. Second Edition. Minneapolis/St. Paul: West Publishing Company, 1994.

Stanford, Michael. *The Nature of Historical Knowledge*. Oxford and Cambridge: Blackwell, 1986.

Taruskin, Richard. "Back to Whom? Neoclassicism as Ideology." Review of Scott Messing, *Neoclassicism in Music: From the Genesis of the Concept through the Schoenberg/Stravinsky Polemic*. Studies in Musicology, No. 101. Ann Arbor and London: UMI Research Press, 1988. In *19th-Century Music* 16/3 (Spring 1993): 286-302.

Taruskin, Richard. "Some Thoughts on the History and Historiography of Russian Music." *The Journal of Musicology* 3/4 (Fall 1984): 321-339.

Tosh, John. *The Pursuit of History: Aims, Methods and New Directions in the Study of Modern History*. Second Edition. London and New York: Longman, 1991.

Treitler, Leo. "Gender and Other Dualities of Music." In Ruth A. Solie, ed., *Musicology and Difference: Gender and Sexuality in Music Scholarship*, 23-45. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press, 1993.

_____. "What Kind of Story is History?" In Leo Treitler, *Music and the Historical Imagination*, 157-175. Cambridge, Massachusetts and London, England: Harvard University Press, 1989.

Veyne, Paul. *Writing History: Essay on Epistemology*. Translated by Mina Moore-Rinvolucri. Middletown, Connecticut: Wesleyan University Press, 1984.

Wapnewski, Peter. "The Operas as Literary Works." Translated by Peter Palmer. In Ulrich Müller and Peter Wapnewski, eds., *Wagner Handbook*, 3-95. Translation edited by John Deathridge. Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press, 1992.

White, Hayden. "The Historical Text as Literary Artifact." In Hazard Adams and Leroy Searle, eds., *Critical Theory since 1965*, 394-407. Tallahassee: Florida State University Press, 1992.

Wolff, Larry. *Inventing Eastern Europe: The Map of Civilization on the Mind of the Enlightenment*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1994.

Woolf, Stuart, ed. *Nationalism in Europe, 1815 to the Present: A Reader.* London and New York: Routledge, 1996.